

M.A.S.S.

SMALL AND RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

TASK FORCE REPORT

September 2008



The Effectiveness, Value, and Importance of Small School Districts

September 17, 2008

Linda E. Driscoll, Ed.D.

University of Massachusetts Amherst

In consultation with the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents' Small and Rural School
District Task Force

Nicholas Young, Ph.D., Ed.D.

Superintendent of Schools, Hadley, Massachusetts

Professor Francis Gougeon

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Patricia Stevens

Superintendent of Schools, Granby, Massachusetts

Professor Matthew Millitello, Ph.D.

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Patrice Dardenne

Superintendent of Schools, Hatfield, Massachusetts

Dayle Doiron

Superintendent of Schools, Pioneer Valley Regional District

Massachusetts

Peter J. Azar, Ed.D.

Superintendent of Schools, Winchendon, Massachusetts

Table of Contents

	page
Executive Summary.....	1
Background.....	1
Introduction.....	5
Research Findings.....	7
Definition of Small Schools.....	7
Indicators of Student Success.....	9
Graduation and Dropout Rates and Attendance.....	10
Post-graduation plans.....	11
Extra-Curricular Participation.....	12
Student Achievement.....	13
Safety and a Sense of Belonging.....	14
Teacher Attitude, Morale, Longevity.....	15
Parent and Community Involvement.....	16
Movement Toward Consolidation.....	17
Fiscal Implications.....	22
Suggestions for Efficiency and Collaboration.....	24
Recommendations.....	25
Conclusions	26

References.....	27
-----------------	----

Appendices

A. Configurations.....	30
B. Demographic Indicators.....	33
C. Teacher Indicators.....	37
D. Student Indicators.....	41
E. Post Graduation Indicators.....	44
F. Financial Indicators.....	46
G. Small Academic Regional District Financial Indicators.....	50
H. Small District LEA Financial Indicators.....	52

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The MASS Small and Rural School District Task Force work was supported by the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents. The establishment of the Task Force was motivated by concerns about the ability of small school districts to meet the needs of all students in the current climate of accountability and diminishing resources. Additionally, there exists in Massachusetts a political current to consolidate small school districts as a means of addressing fiscal constraints in educational spending. In light of this recent interest in school consolidation, and in the midst of fiscal constraints, the task force set out to investigate economic efficiency as well as student learning outcomes in small school districts. To this end, the task force investigated the existing literature from across the nation and then specifically investigated the economic and student learning outcomes in small districts (2000 students or less) in Massachusetts.

What Was Learned from the Research (Nationally and in Massachusetts)

Student Success

The task force found the research on small school effectiveness overwhelmingly supportive. Regarding indicators of student success such as graduation rate, dropout rate, post graduation plans and attendance, small schools/districts examined in the national research as well as those studied in Massachusetts schools all fared better than larger schools. Our Massachusetts sample of small schools showed that as compared to the average rate of Massachusetts Districts:

- The graduation rate was 6.5% better (see Figure 1)
- The dropout rate in the small districts was 2.5% lower (see Figure 2)
- The attendance rate was 2.1% better (see Figure 3)
- 3.7% more students enroll in colleges after graduation (see Figure 4)

Several researchers promote per-graduate cost versus per-pupil rate as a more accurate indicator of financial comparisons. If this were the determinant of fiscal economy, small school districts would be seen as more economical than their larger counterparts in the long run.

In regards to student achievement, research is mixed, with some studies showing no difference and some showing superiority. However, our literature research found no evidence that larger schools perform better. In our analysis of Massachusetts school districts, using Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data, we found that:

- Statewide, 20 percent of the state's districts are "in status"- that is, not making sufficient progress in improving the performance of their students either as a whole or for certain subgroups. However, in our sample of small districts we discovered that only 6 percent are "in status". (See Figure 5.)

Other School Success Indicators

The research, particularly as reported by Cotton (1996 and 2001) and Jimerson (2006), indicated that small schools:

- are safer (NCES 2000);
- have students more involved in extra-curricular activities;
- generate a better sense of belonging and well being for students, and, since students are better known to the adults in the building, they experience less alienation;
- have a teacher force that has higher morale (shown to be linked to higher student achievement), longevity, and better attitudes toward their teaching responsibilities and students;
- allow teachers a greater opportunity to work together collegially in ways that are not only beneficial to improving curriculum offerings to students, but in ways that are fulfilling and reflective of their practice;
- have more active parent and community involvement where generations come together for a variety of activities; and
- have ownership and pride in their schools, are less intimidated, and feel more comfortable in schools where they and their children are known to the staff.

In our Massachusetts small district sample we learned that the mean percentage of teachers classified as highly qualified exceeds the state average by 1.6 percent and the mean student/teacher ratio improves on the state average by almost 1 less per teacher.

School Consolidation

The most powerful rationale for consolidation is economic efficiency followed by increased curricular offerings. However, neither of these rationales have any strong support in research. Several studies over the past 50 years (Eyre,2002; Gritter & Silvernail, 2007; Hirsch,1960; Jewel,1989; Kennedy,1989; Rural School and Community Trust, 2003; Strifel,1998; Valencia,1984; Yan, 2006) have shown that over time

consolidation has not resulted in any significant savings and reductions in per-pupil costs have been very little if at all.

Some findings from these studies indicate that:

- The only area where there were statistically significant savings was in administrative costs in the first year; however, these savings were often offset by increases in other costs related to larger and sometimes more impersonal schools (more guidance and discipline services, maintenance, security, and new levels of administration such as coordinators). Interestingly, the research suggests that early administrative savings tend to be very short-term only, as larger organizations have a strong tendency toward creating more extensive and costly administrative bureaucracy within a few years; thus explaining why administrative savings are typically lost within the second year.
- Transportation costs can show an initial savings; however, in rural school districts they often increase due to longer distances and restraints upon seat time.
- Larger districts can offer a wider variety of course offerings such as advanced placement courses; however, achievement levels in small schools are as good as, if not better than, larger ones. Interestingly, there are a number of small districts that offer full advanced placement programs as well, despite their size: thus school and district size is not necessarily a determiner of the scope of curricular offerings available to students.
- Teacher salary scales can increase when districts are combined and thus negate any staffing savings.
- There are instances when consolidation does work- usually when voluntarily and thoughtfully planned and initiated, and when the resulting size is not too large.
- Per-pupil expenditures exhibit a U-shaped association with size, with the largest and smallest schools showing diseconomies of scale (Fox, 1980).
- Small schools fear that once a larger district is formed the smaller communities lose their voice on school committees and risk school closings. This seems to have been proven in Arkansas and West Virginia (Johnson, 2006; Rural School and Community Trust, 2002).
- Other states across the country are investigating and implementing legislatively mandated school consolidation plans. The research regarding the effectiveness of these legislatively forced plans is not encouraging. In our neighboring states of Vermont and Maine there is much citizen dissatisfaction with such plans. Maine,

in particular, which just this year implemented such a plan, is experiencing much citizen push-back through a citizen petition drive, as well as many bills filed to amend or repeal the law.

Financial

All school districts in Massachusetts are struggling with decreasing resources and a greater reliance upon the municipal revenues. From 2002 to 2006, the commonwealth's proportion of school funding has dropped from 34 to 30 percent. Fixed costs such as insurance and utilities, as well as growing special education costs, have forced school systems to cut other areas of their budget. School districts have had to ask more and more fiscal support from their cities and towns; and are often forced to try to fund their schools through over-ride votes, which are difficult to pass due to a declining economy and taxpayer fatigue. Declining enrollment has pushed school systems to face the daunting task of closing much loved and effective schools, particularly in the more rural parts of the state. The foundation budget categories have not kept up with the realities of school funding in Massachusetts, and it does not seem likely that a great infusion of financial resources is going to be available in the near future.

In our small district sample we learned that:

- In all but two districts the actual versus required spending is in excess of 100 per cent, much like those of other districts across the commonwealth (refer to Massachusetts Department of Education School Funding Report dated January 2008).
- The average spending levels of these districts exceeds the state required level by 30 percent (of those districts filing a report).{It is, however, noteworthy that a relatively small handful or particularly wealthy small districts have skewed the mean findings. Many small districts are operating quite economically at or new the net school-spending minimum.}
- The mean per-pupil cost of the sample exceeded the state average by \$165.00.
- Stand-alone small districts spent less per pupil than regional academic districts in the sample.

Essential Conclusions

- Small school districts are successful. Our sample of small districts outperformed the state average on all of the DOE indicators investigated (attendance rate, drop-out rate, AYP status graduation rate, pursuit of post secondary education, percentage of highly qualified teachers, and staff/ pupil ratio).

- Small districts must make all efforts to insure that they are working to maximum fiscal efficiency. Through working with already established educational collaboratives and forming inter-local sharing compacts between neighboring districts, greater economies of scale can be created to expedite greater efficiencies in many aspects of educating students. Such areas as purchasing, maintenance, staff sharing, professional development, and curriculum programming should be explored.
- The success of small districts, as determined by this report, suggests that challenges such as declining enrollments and higher per-pupil costs should be incorporated into the discussion of the revision of the Chapter 70 formula.
- The state should provide incentives and grants to assist small districts in acquiring newer technologies such as regional web-based clearing houses to assist collaboration and sharing. Regional technological centers established to assist with data warehousing and student data analysis should also be supported.
- Given the success of small districts, it is incumbent upon the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to not only preserve what is working so well, but to provide assistance in replicating successes across the commonwealth by putting into place appropriate support mechanisms, financial and otherwise.
- According to our findings, consolidation efforts work best when they are voluntary and supported with state incentives. Forced consolidation should not be part of any cost saving plan initiated by the state, especially in light of the research that suggests consolidation efforts may well result in no fiscal savings.
- We endorse a conceptual shift whereby the definition of school efficiency gives equal weight to effectiveness (as measured by student success) as that given to operational economy.

INTRODUCTION

If we were to define the ideal school district, both through the results of our own experiences as educators, and as a result of our analysis of recent research, our definition would be: safe, student-centered with a curriculum not only aligned with standards but one that encourages higher-order thinking skills and creativity; a place where children are well known to adults; where community involvement is active and effective; where the students are responsible, respectful, and engaged, and have high graduation rates, attendance, and involvement in school activities; where the staff is

able to collaborate with colleagues, participate in distributive leadership, and have a sense of power and ownership in their jobs.

What has just been described are elements found to a large extent in small school districts. The effectiveness of small schools/districts is strongly supported through research and in recent years through funding support and grants through such agencies as the Federal Smaller Learning Communities Initiative, the Carnegie Foundation of New York, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Annenberg Challenge, the Joyce Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trust, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation (Cotton, 1996).

Despite the value of smaller learning environments there has been a great movement toward consolidation in the United States.

According [to] the National Center for Education Statistics, the US had 117,108 school Districts in 1937-1938, the first year for which numbers were available. During that same year, there were approximately 250,000 public schools. By 1999-2000, the number of districts had been reduced to just 14, 928 and the number of schools to just 92, 012. This dramatic reduction in the number of schools and districts occurred even though public school enrollment rose from 25.5 million to 46.9 million during the same time period (Rural School and Community Trust, 2006 March)

The main motivation for the consolidation movement over the past 70 years appears to have been primarily financial considerations. The idea is that larger school districts are less expensive to run - less maintenance and less administration, in particular. Another benefit of consolidation is thought to be greater curriculum and athletic choices.

The “bigger is better” or the simplistic “bigger is cheaper” concept seems to have been the underlying principle as schools have been configured in the last 70 years. But is this the case? Is it supported through research? Do we need to pay better attention to the scale of our schools and make decisions that will in the long run be more successful and effective for all students?

As schools are facing declining enrollment, particularly in the western part of Massachusetts, educators and communities are struggling to provide the resources necessary to meet the needs of students in an era of standards and accountability and increasing special education costs. As we look to instituting policies to restructure the delivery of educational services, we must be careful to first examine the existing effective school structures. Only after comprehensive examination should we consider further consolidation and creating larger schools. We are obligated to ask of the research, “Do bigger school districts actually save money and are students more or less successful in bigger schools?”

The No Child Left Behind Act requires schools to ensure that all children have the proficiencies, skills, and content knowledge to thrive and contribute to their communities' futures. Educators and policy makers should be certain that our decisions are in the best interests of all children.

In this paper, we will be investigating the findings of recent research on the effectiveness of small schools and districts. We will also investigate the effectiveness of consolidation efforts. Finally, we will be grappling with the financial challenges facing these small districts and ways to continue to offer a comprehensive quality educational experience to all students in Massachusetts despite worsening economic times. We will be contrasting this research with our exploration of the effectiveness of small districts in Massachusetts (that is, districts with student populations under 2000). To accomplish this, we will analyze data from small districts in Massachusetts in such areas as: indicators of student success (AYP, graduation, drop-out rate, post graduation plans and attendance) and staff and financial data.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The superiority of small schools has been established with clarity and at a level of confidence rare in the annals of education research (Raywid, 1999).

A successful school districts is measured by more than the results of testing and accountability programs. The essential elements which leads to students' full educational experience include a variety of factors which set the environmental conditions necessary for good teaching and learning. In her research reviewing 103 documents, Cotton (1996) discovered that many of the key indicators of school quality and student success are present in small schools/districts. Below is a discussion of these key indicators.

Definition of Small Schools

The preponderance of professional literature indicates that educational researchers support the concept of small school effectiveness. It appears however, that the determinants of school size are seldom results of research... More often, school size is the result of other factors-political, economic, social, demographic...(Williams, 1990)

There is no clear agreement on what constitutes a small school (or district) in the literature reviewed. Williams writes that elementary schools should be in the range of 300 to 400 and secondary schools 400 to 800 (Williams, 1990). For the purpose of our study, we have defined a small district as having an enrollment of 2000 students or less. In Massachusetts, this describes 161 of the 331 districts; however, we focused on 134 academic districts, excluding the vocational schools/districts as they are

programmatically different from the academic districts and therefore not easily comparable to the other districts in this study. Except for a few larger regional one-district high schools, the majority of the schools examined fit our definition of a small school. It is also interesting to note that 75 percent of school districts in the United States are considered small with fewer than 2500 students (Yan, 2006).

Small schools tend to be in small districts. The correlation between school size and district size is .381 - significant at the .001 level (Common Core of Data (CCD), 2003-04). The bulk of the research is focused on small schools. For the purposes of this study we will use the terms small schools and small districts interchangeably.

Although the research is quite compelling regarding the success of smallness in schools, readers should not conclude that smallness in itself is the mitigating factor. In fact, school characteristics that lead to improved teaching and learning, such as more personalized attention, greater student affiliation, teacher collegiality, parent involvement, ability to assess knowledge, and differentiate curriculum, are easier to implement in smaller schools.

Although some students do well in larger schools, they are usually students from more affluent communities. Unfortunately, often times the students who do benefit more from smaller school communities are in larger and more dysfunctional urban schools. As reported in the U.S. Department of Education's overview of smaller learning communities in high schools,

According to a continuing Rural School and Community Trust study called Matthew Project, smaller schools and smaller districts help narrow the achievement gap between students from poorer communities and their peers from wealthier communities... This four –state study of 13,600 public schools in Georgia, Montana, Ohio and Texas, demonstrated that reducing school size produced proportionately greater results for schools with more students from low-income families, and that smaller schools reduced the negative effect of poverty on school performance by at least 20 percent and by as much as 70 percent in both urban and rural schools. (U.S. Department of Education, 2001)

Jimerson (2006,) in her report on why small works in public schools, cites Abbot, Joiremena, and Stroh (2002), Howley (1996) and Walberg (1994) finding small districts were associated with higher academic achievement, and that this association is especially pronounced for high poverty districts. Walberg's study examined National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) data, while the others used other state-level standardized tests.

Historically the move toward large schools was influenced by the concept that larger schools can use staff and other resources more efficiently; thus per-pupil rates would go down, curriculum offerings could be broader, a more efficient class size could be created, and administrative costs could be cut. Indeed, some of these goals can be met through consolidation and the creation of larger schools. However, do these improvements lead to more successful students as defined by NCLB and the indicators of student success to be discussed next? It is essential that we meet the needs of all students and creating larger more bureaucratic and less personalized school appears to often be counterproductive to that goal. Interestingly, while the research does indicate that administrative costs, as but on example, can be reduced potentially in the short-term through consolidation, such findings indicate that such savings typically dissipate quickly and may lead to ultimately larger administrative overhead. Unquestionably, class sizes can be increased through consolidation, while an expansion of curriculum offerings may or may not result and be sustained.

Indicators of Student Success

School size is a variable which continues to receive attention as a determinant of educational achievement. Recently, size has figured conspicuously in discussions of educational equity, as well as effectiveness. (Bickel, 1999)

Graduation Rate, Dropout Rate, and Attendance.

While MCAS and other assessment data are good indicators of student success, it might be argued that the most reliable and true method of determining a school's success is the graduation rate. It can be further argued that a per-graduate rate is a better indicator of the cost of educating a student than a per-pupil rate. A study of New York City high schools found that smaller schools produce stronger performance (as measured by attendance rates, test scores, and number of graduates), particularly among poor students. They typically had higher per-student costs than most of the city's high schools, but they were more cost effective because they produced higher than average graduation rates (Streifel, 1998). Green and Winters (Greene, 2005) also found that smaller districts had higher graduation rates. In our study, we determined that our small district sample's graduation rate was 6.5% higher than the state average (see Figure 1). The "so-called inefficiencies of small school districts are greatly reduced when calculated on the basis of "cost per graduate" and virtually disappear when the substantial social costs of non-graduates are considered" (Funk & Bailey, as cited in Lawrence et al., 2002).




Figure 1. Small School Districts' Graduation Rate Compared to State Average

The other side of the higher graduation coin is a lowered dropout rate. The research literature supports the fact that smaller schools/districts have lower dropout rates. Toenjes, in his 1989 study, concluded that there was a strong positive influence between school size and drop-out rate (Toenjes, 1989). Cotton also reports that nine of the ten documents she reviewed favored the ability of small schools to better keep their students through graduation. She also discovered that attendance rates were better in small schools. (Cotton, 1996). The target districts in our study had a dropout rate 2.5% less than the state average and the attendance rate was 2.1% higher (See Figures 2 and 3).




Figure 2. Small Districts' Drop-Out Rate Compared to State Average




Figure 3. Small Districts' Attendance Rate Compared to State Average

Post Graduation Plans

There does not seem to be great disparity in college-related variables for students attending large or small schools. However, there are several studies that do point to higher participation in college attendance. Wasley et al's study in particular found that more students from smaller schools attend college. In their study of small schools in Chicago, researchers found that not only was the college enrollment higher but these students made significant improvements in school behavior and achievement, attended five more days of school per semester, dropped out at one-third to one-half the rate, and had higher grade point averages and reading scores with math holding steady (Wasley et al., 2000).

In this study, we learned that 3.7 percent more graduates enrolled in college, .1 percent more graduates pursue other post secondary training, .3 percent fewer graduates enter the work force, and .4 percent fewer graduates enlist in the military than the state statistics (see Figure 4).




Figure 4. Small Districts' Post Secondary Plans Compared to State Averages

Extra-Curricular Participation

In schools with limited enrollment, almost every student is needed for extracurricular activities to occur. In small schools, no student is extraneous. (Jimerson, 2006)

The research is clear in regards to the greater involvement of students in extra-curricular participation in small schools. It also appears that students in smaller schools participate in a wider variety of activities. Hamilton in discussing the differences between extracurricular participation in small vs. large schools, points out that in large schools there are far more potential participants than can be accommodated and a large percentage of students will find themselves left out, whereas in small schools the problem is not in selecting students, but in finding them (Hamilton, 1983). Therefore, in smaller schools/districts there are very few students who do not participate in anything. This article further states that extracurricular participation of students in smaller high schools was twice as high as in larger schools (Barker R.G. & Gump, 1964).

Does extra-curricular participation translate into other areas of school success? In a school where students are known, feel respected and appreciated, and are encouraged to participate in activities outside of the classroom, they may be more likely to gain satisfaction from the schooling experience, more likely to stay until graduation, and more invested in performing well in their studies. As Jimerson (2006) reports in her policy brief extra-curricular participation is associated with several positive outcomes for students: they have more positive attitudes about their school experience and learning, have higher self-esteem, and have higher expectations about obtaining a college degree (Lipsomb, 2005; Mahoney & Cairns, 1997; O'Brien E. & Rollefson, 1995). Extra-curricular participation is also related to higher grade-point averages, higher

standardized test results, and better attendance rates (MahoneyJ & Cairns, 1997).
(National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000)

Although some might not consider extracurricular participation to be as compelling as other curricular and accountability measures, it appears nonetheless to be very powerful in affecting the overall experience of students, particularly at the high school level.

Student Achievement

Researchers observe that the effects of smallness on achievement are indirect, being mediated through other small-school features as quality of the social environment and students' sense of attachment to the school. (Cotton, 2001)

In her review of 31 studies regarding school size and achievement, Cotton (2001) discovered that about half of the documents find no difference between the achievement levels of students in large and small schools. The other half found that student achievement in smaller schools/districts was superior. None of the studies show large schools/districts to be superior to small. Of particular note was the finding that minority students and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds have more positive achievement in smaller schools.

Deborah Meier, a proponent of small learning environments attributes the success of the schools she has led (Central Park East in New York City and Mission Hill Elementary in Boston) to a variety of factors such as:

- A strong sense of staff collegiality
- Big decisions being made by the people who have to implement them
- Families having strong ties and positive relationship with staff
- Time for staff to collaborate
- Strong support from a district leader

(Meier, 2002)

It is also notable that small schools meet individual student's needs quite well and provide them with better preparation for college or post secondary plans. As Cotton (2008) reports "according to (Roelke, 1996), researchers have found...that core curricular offerings in small high school settings overall are well aligned with National goals." In fact they have determined that high schools enrolling as few as 100 to 200 students offer base courses in core curricular areas such as mathematics and science at rates comparable to high schools enrolling between 1,200 to 1,600 students.

From these studies it is reasonable to conclude that small schools are equal to and often better than large schools in regards to student achievement. In an era of standards and accountability it appears that one of the most powerful routes to increasing student success is a well designed, well managed, collegial and community inclusive small school.

In looking at how our population of small districts fared in regards to an indicator of student success and achievement - the Annual Yearly Progress report (AYP) - we were pleased to discover that the school districts in our sample performed significantly better than the state average. “Statewide 38 percent of the state’s schools and 20% of districts are “in status” –that is, as not making sufficient progress in improving the performance of their students, either as a whole or for certain student subgroups”(Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008). In our study we determined that of the 134 academic districts reviewed in this study, 6 percent were considered underperforming and “in status.” Although this is only one indicator of student achievement, it nonetheless illustrates a significant improvement over the general state average for an important accountability standard (See Figure 5).




Figure 5. Small Districts AYP Status Compared to State Average

Safety and a Sense of Belonging

Why are small schools safer? Research indicates that the climate in small schools fosters closer relationships between the adults and students, and among the students themselves. As a result, students feel more engaged with the school community and these close relationships are accompanied by greater mutual respect. (Jimerson, 2006)

We have learned from our study of Maslow’s theory (Maslow, 1968) that feeling safe is essential to free the mind for learning: therefore, if students do not feel safe, the conditions for learning are diminished. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES 2000), violence and discipline are less of a problem in smaller schools. The smaller class sizes, which allow students to be known to their teachers and peers,

lead to a sense of belonging and being understood and appreciated. Such discipline problems as fighting, bullying, and classroom disruptions are fewer, which leads to an environment where learning can thrive. The anonymity associated with larger schools impedes these positive social interactions between students. When students are known to adults, often interventions can occur before discipline and emotional issues get out of hand. Klonsky reports that, when asked what he would do about the scourge of juvenile violence, James Garbarino, director of the Family Life Development Center at Cornell University, answered, “At the adolescent level, If I could do one single thing, it would be to ensure that teenagers are not in a high school bigger than 400 to 500 students (New York Times, Dec 30, 1994)” (Klonsky, 2002). Because students in small schools are able to get to know one another better, build relationships, and develop better interpersonal skills, it would appear that many of the disruptions, which can impact on the learning environment, are lessened. Anonymity, feeling disenfranchised and unimportant, can lead to some of the more serious Columbine-type occurrences which have scarred schools in the past decade. Deborah Meier, the founder of New York’s celebrated Central Park East School, reports that in small schools everyone belongs and is known. The community supports adult-child relationships that allow teachers to pass on the habits of heart and mind that define an educated person, not just through lesson plans, but through the daily give and take of sustaining a community.

We’re more likely to show kids in our daily discourses that grown-ups – models outside the home – use reasoning and evidence to resolve issues. We can teach them what it is like to be a grow-up-bring them into our culture, but only if we are part of a world that we find compelling, credible and accessible. (Meier, 1996)

Teacher Attitude, Morale, Longevity, and Instructional Delivery Models

It helps if those most directly involved have sufficient autonomy over critical decisions. Only then will it be fair to hold people accountable for the impact of their decisions. This will entail creating democratic adult communities that have the power to make decisions about staffing, leadership, and the full use of their budget as well as about particulars of scheduling, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. (Meier, 1998)

In this age of heightened accountability for teachers, it seems apparent that teachers would be more effective if they had more autonomy and power to bring about student success in their classrooms. Small schools and districts set a scenario that leads to more participation by teachers. In smaller schools, the faculty is well known to each other, personal and professional relationships can be facilitated more readily, and teachers have closer personal relationships with students. This closeness of student-teacher relationships, opportunities for pertinent professional development, and strong collegial professional community relations lends itself to higher job satisfaction and greater teacher longevity. Teachers in small districts in Massachusetts also exceed the

state average of teachers classified as highly qualified by 1.6 percent. This seems to indicate that small districts attract excellent teachers.

In smaller schools teachers have the opportunity to work together collegially in ways that are not only beneficial to improving curriculum offerings to students, but in ways that are fulfilling and reflective of their practice. Such instructional delivery models as

team teaching, cooperative learning, content integration across subjects, experiential education, and other instructional approaches are more often found in small schools, probably because alternative teaching strategies are easier to implement in small settings. (U.S. Department of Education, 2001)

Jimerson (2006) asks: "Why are teacher attitudes and morale important?" then cites the work of (Lumsden, 1998) and (Lee & Loeb, 2000), whose research shows that an increase in teacher morale is linked to increased student learning. She speculates that student achievement gains from attending small schools occur, at least in part, because of indirect pathways starting with positive attitudes. Lee and Loeb (2000) found that "teachers in small schools exhibit greater "collective responsibility" toward student well-being and success than teachers in larger schools, which in turn translates into higher student academic performance."

Parent and Community Involvement

Communication between parent and teacher is much more meaningful when both are well acquainted with the child. Parents who find it intimidating to confront the sheer scale of bureaucratic complexity of large schools typically feel more welcome-because they are more welcome, indeed needed-in small schools. (Cotton 2001)

A school where the parents and community feel pride and ownership is more likely to be supported and appreciated. Small districts contain schools that are more aligned with their sponsoring communities and also serve, particularly in rural areas, as the heart of the community. They are often the places where people gather for such activities as voting, community meetings, athletics and physical fitness classes, senior citizen meal programs, community dinners, and social gatherings.

Of all civic institutions in a village, however, the school serves the broadest constituencies. Not only do schools meet the educational needs of a community and may be a source of employment for village residents, the local school also provides social, cultural and recreational opportunities. It is a place where generations come together and community identity is forged. (Langdon, 2000)

Lyson reports from his study of rural communities in New York that “Even in the smallest rural villages in New York, schools serve as important markers of social and economic viability and vitality” (Lyson, 2002).

Given the pride and connection citizens and parents feel toward their schools, it is not surprising that there is more involvement in smaller local schools. More and more, educators are realizing the importance of community connection. Administrative standards for principals in particular are putting a greater emphasis on developing a skill set that would focus on parent and community involvement in schools. Small schools and districts, which have those connections, are better poised to encourage and support that kind of involvement. David Matthews of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation is concerned that “public schools are losing their connection to a democratic public and that citizens are losing their sense of ownership and responsibility for these schools” (Matthews, 2008). According to Phillip Schlechty, the erosion of local control, which began in the late 1950s, has impacted upon the participation of local citizens in their schools. Although he admits that the needs of businesses for

...a world class work force and colleges for qualified students are important, good schools require strong communities to support them. It is time state legislators and members of Congress awakened to the fact that the best chance we have of significantly improving the quality of education received by most Americans is to revitalize the idea of local control of schools....I will argue that placing local communities at the center of the debate over standards is the best way to build such trustworthy communities. It is also the best way to create great schools in every community. (Schlechty 2008)

As school districts get larger both in student population and geographic area, the ability for parents and community members to be involved and committed to their school system diminishes. This can have such negative effects on schools as lack of financial support, less involvement of parents in their children’s learning and extra-curricular activities, and a lessening of pride in their schools.

Movement Toward Consolidation

Why the state should have an overriding interest in consolidating schools so that a few students are able to study calculus, physics and a fourth year of German-to say nothing of rock poetry- eludes us. (Haller, Monk, Spotted Bear, Griffith, & Moss, 1990)

The consolidation movement is not new. Previous movements toward consolidation across the country have greatly reduced the numbers of districts and schools -117,108 in 1938 to 14,928 in 2000 - a reduction of 87 percent (Rural School and Community Trust, 2006 March). Many of the school districts currently in Massachusetts that would

be the potential target of consolidation efforts have already been through several regionalization initiatives and studies. Policymakers over the years have encouraged and rewarded those consolidation efforts, but is there research to justify the success of these policies?

The most powerful rationale for consolidation is economic efficiency, followed by increased curricular offerings. However, neither of these rationales is validated by the research.

In several studies over the last 50 years documented by the Rural School and Community Trust (Rural School and Community Trust, 2003), there has been no indication that consolidation results in any significant savings over time. Hirsch's 1960 study of 29 school districts near St. Louis concluded that "There were no consistent economies of scale, and that sharing academic programs would be a more cost-effective way than consolidations to deal with the fiscal problems of districts" (Hirsch, 1960). Valencia, in his 1984 review of 40 studies, concluded that "closing schools reduces per-pupil costs very little, if at all" (Valencia, 1984). Jewell, studying data from 50 states and Washington D.C., found that per pupil costs and student enrollment were not statistically related, suggesting that there are no economies of scale (Jewell, 1989). In a study of 330 school districts in Arkansas, Kennedy (Kennedy & al, 1989) concluded that "there is no evidence to suggest that consolidation of small school districts into larger ones will necessarily reduce expenditures per student, increase standardized test scores, or reduce dropout rates" (Kennedy, 1989). Streifel's analysis of revenue and expenditure changes for three years before and after nineteen school consolidations, comparing the rate of change to the average state rate of change, indicated no significant financial advantage. In fact, he only saw statistically significant changes in administrative costs (a 21 percent decrease) (Streifel, 1998). However, he found that these savings were more than offset by increases in other costs. In the end, total per-pupil costs in the consolidating districts increased slightly (32% from 29%). In a series of articles by the Charleston Gazette (Eyre, 2002) on the cost of school closings in West Virginia, it was discovered that, over a ten-year period where the state had closed 325 schools to save money, they actually increased the number of central office administrators despite the system declining in student numbers by 41,000, and pupil transportation costs more than doubled. In his study of comparing countywide versus non-countywide districts in Pennsylvania, Yan (Yan, 2006) did not find statistical differences in per-pupil costs for consolidated districts. His study also did not support the concept of administrative efficiency through school consolidation.

Transportation is another area where proponents of consolidation argue that savings can be made. One study found that when schools consolidated there would be an initial saving, but then the rates of increase would be similar to those prior to consolidation (Gritter & Silvernail, 2007). When rural schools are closed because of consolidation, the

costs might actually go up because of longer distances and restraints upon student bus seat time.

Larger consolidated schools can offer more curricular offerings and advanced placement courses; however, as has been discussed earlier in this paper, achievement levels are at least as good if not better in smaller districts. Therefore, it seems apparent that other methods of offering more diversity in the curriculum should be explored before consolidation.

When school systems consolidate and annex smaller districts, pay scales often increase in the newer district. Because generally all schools assume the highest pay scales of all the districts, some of the consolidation savings are negated.

Citizens faced with consolidation policies fear that local input and control will be weakened. School closings (even when promises are made to the contrary) are inevitable as larger districts with more voting members annex these smaller schools. Property values can decline in areas where schools have been closed, which could negatively impact the tax base. "The socio-economic impact of schools on communities is significant, and school closures reduce the fiscal capacity of local communities to provide support for education" (Rural School and Community Trust, 2003). In his analysis of 352 incorporated villages in New York, Lyson (Lyson, 2002) discovered that in small communities:

- Sixty percent of the communities with schools saw population growth from 1990 to 2000; only 46 percent of those without schools grew.
- Average housing values in the communities with schools are 25 percent higher than in those without schools. Their houses are newer and more likely to be served by municipal water and sewer systems
- Communities with schools enjoy higher per capita incomes, a more equal distribution of income, less per capita income from public assistance, less poverty, and less child poverty.
- Communities with schools have more professional, managerial and executive workers; more households with self employment income; 57 percent higher per capita income from self-employment; a higher percentage of residents who work in the village; and fewer workers who commute more than 15 minutes to their jobs.
- The differences between larger rural communities with schools and those without were similar, but not as extreme as the difference in the smaller communities.

The existence of a school in a community also has an economic impact on the community. Since the school is also an employer of local citizens and a consumer of local retail sales. Sederberg in his study of six rural Minnesota counties found that the school district payroll accounted for between four and nine percent of the total county payroll, and district expenditures accounted for between one and three percent of the county's total retail sales. The take home pay of the school employees ranged from five to ten percent of total retail sales (Sederberg, 1987).

When schools close particularly in rural communities the quality of life is impacted. No longer is there a place for community activities where the school may be the only place in town for such activities to take place. In a Report sponsored by the Rural and Community Trust (Lawrence. B.K. et al., 2002), the impact of school consolidation on civic participation is examined –

as schools have consolidated and grown larger, decision making authority has been transferred from local communities into the hands of state officials and school administrators, local citizens have less say over such matters as curriculum, educational standards, budgets, and teacher qualifications, and less and less are involved in the day-to-day operations. Perhaps most significantly, consolidation has dramatically reduced citizen participation in the governance of the nation's education system. Between 1930 and today the number of people serving on school boards fell from 1 million to fewer than 200,000 (while U.S. population doubled).

Now there may be some who do not see these facts as necessarily problematic, however these issues need to be considered as policies are developed that will lead to less citizen involvement and responsibility for the nation's schools.

Many states across the country are grappling with the consolidation issue. Presently Maine in particular is involved in a very contentious battle. In the current school year of 2007-08, school districts in Maine were forced to join with other districts to create districts that have a minimum of 2500 students. This consolidation movement hopes to reduce the number of districts from 290 to about 80. A few high performing and very rural districts are excluded. More than 60 bills to repeal or modify the law have been filed and a citizen petition drive is being formed to put the issue on the ballot for repeal. Of 160 reorganization plans filed fewer than half met state approval as of October of 2007. Two dozen were flatly rejected and 60 were in limbo. Other issues of combining wealthy and poorer communities are causing problems and some plans are being rejected which fit the criteria for exemptions. In a Report by Stephen Bowen of the Maine Heritage Policy Center indicated that the fifteen smallest districts in Maine performed better than the fifteen largest in percentage of graduates and post-secondary enrollment. This suggested that small districts are successful and economically feasible

particularly when using graduation rate versus per-pupil spending. He states “ The proper course for state policy makers at this point is to redirect the school reform discussion away from a ceaseless focus on the size of school districts and on to what schools and districts that are succeeding across Maine are doing right” (Bowen, 2007).

According to the Rural and School Community Trust (2007) Vermont legislators were also pursuing a plan to close districts in Vermont to improve efficiency. Right now since Vermont’s districts are combined in supervisory unions there are only sixty-two superintendents in Vermont. This consolidation movement supposedly would not eliminate superintendents, schools, or personnel. However School board control would be reduced in creating these large districts. Well, the Vermonters were not happy as it is their view that their schools are successful. Citizens were well represented at the hearing for school consolidation. At this point school consolidation is not part of an education bill.

In Pennsylvania, Yen (2006) did not find in his study that school district consolidation was cost efficient, increased administrative capacity, or led to more curricular offerings.

In New York, in a two-year study of organizational alternatives for New York’s small rural districts, it was determined that “district reorganization, as a solution to the problems of small rural schools, has very serious deficiencies” (Monk, 2004).

In Arkansas, despite claims that legislation to consolidate schools was not intended to close schools, forty-two (42) schools that had been annexed by larger districts closed. “Where district reorganization results in the dilution of the political representation, especially in poor and African American communities, school closures are almost certain to follow” (Johnson, 2006).

Since 1990, West Virginia has closed over 300 schools; however, among some of the results reported in “Closing Costs” (Eyre, 2002) indicate that this consolidation movement has not been successful.

- The state has spent \$1 billion on school consolidation
- A higher percentage of budgets are spent on maintenance and utilities
- Local administrators have increased by 16 percent despite a 13 percent drop in enrollment
- State level administrators have increased
- Transportation costs have risen
- Bus ride times have increased
- Advanced course offerings have not materialized

Louisiana has determined that consolidation is not in the best interest of students and communities and the state. It remains the decision of local boards (Rural School and Community Trust, 2006 March).

It appears that, although there may be some successful consolidations of districts, overwhelmingly it has been the experience that consolidation, particularly legislatively forced consolidation, is not an effective means of saving money and improving teaching and learning in our schools. It also has resulted in school closings, minimizing of local support and governance and an eroding of small communities' quality of life. "Despite extensive literature and research review... there are no clear cut guidelines in respect to the economies of scale in relation to district size, or definitions for optimum district size, or even suggestions for when to consolidate or when not to consolidate" (Strategic Planning Study Group Committee Louisiana Department of Education, 2003). In a state like Massachusetts where local control is valued and pride in schools high, it would seem that any plans toward school or district consolidation must be approached in an inclusive and prudent manner.

Fiscal Implications

Academic expectations and challenges have risen, but spending on instructional services has not kept pace. (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2008)

With the passage of the Education Reform Act of 1993, Massachusetts' schools benefited from a foundation formula that had the goal of creating a funding mechanism that would provide for adequate funding of the state's schools and an equitable distribution of state aide. Until 2003, cities and towns saw healthy increases in Chapter 70 aid to assist the municipalities in funding their schools. But, since that year, the state proportion of school funding has dropped from 34 percent in 2002 to 30 percent in 2006 as local share went from 55 percent to 58 percent. Also the percent dollar change in local funds increased by 26.4 percent as Chapter 70 increased by only 2.4 percent (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008). Cities and towns have struggled to close the ever-increasing funding gaps for schools with varying degree of success. On the average, districts pay 18 percent more than their foundation budget. It is evident that the foundation amounts are not enough to adequately fund education in Massachusetts in these times of higher academic expectations and challenges. Health Insurance, special education services, and fuel costs are budget busters in all school budgets across the state. Couple that with declining enrollment, underfunded state and federal mandates, and the high standard of bringing all students to proficiency by the year 2014, and we can see that the problem of funding schools is a universal problem for all Massachusetts school districts.

Small districts and districts with small schools are often faced with closing schools as a way to answer the statewide problem of declining enrollments and revenues. They

...however may not be able to adjust to enrollment changes as easily. The amount of enrollment decline may not be sufficient to justify major organizational changes, or the community may not support the changes. The decision to close elementary schools in rural regional districts, for example is complicated by the impact that a closure can have on the fabric of a community as well as concern about maintaining reasonable traveling time for younger students. (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008)

In this study we found that, in all but two districts in our sample, the actual versus required spending is in excess of 100 percent (Tantasqua and Winchendon were the exceptions), and average spending of these small districts exceeds the required level (of those districts in the sample reporting). The mean per-pupil cost of the sample districts exceeds the state average by \$165 per pupil. However, in comparing the already consolidated academic regional school districts with the stand-alone town districts, we found that the regional school districts had a per-pupil cost of \$1,420 more than the stand-alone town districts and \$930 more than the state.

The original Massachusetts Foundation formula was crafted in 1993 and is in dire need of reconstitution to deal with the many changes in educational needs and current fiscal realities. Most school districts across Massachusetts are in need of more assistance from the state in the form of a more realistic foundation budget and, consequently, more resources. More efficient operation of schools, higher collaboration between districts and collaboratives, and a more realistic look at what it actually takes to educate a student presently in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts all need to be addressed. However, as the Chapter 70 formula is revisited, it is important to take into consideration the success of small districts as outlined in this paper and to consider the financial means necessary to sustain such school systems. In particular it would be important to look at some funding mechanisms that would allow small districts and schools to continue and to expand their success. Other states have incorporated such mechanisms as necessity aid, hold harmless and rolling average calculations, scarcity aid, and weighting or categorical aid.

It is imperative, as the state and municipalities grapple with the problem of how to adequately fund the state's schools, that any legislation or policy changes be made with the purpose of insuring that what is working and what can work better for the children of Massachusetts are the overriding considerations as we craft fiscal and organizational changes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR EFFICIENCY AND COLLABORATION

Good financial management involves an ongoing quest for solutions to the balancing act that confronts all organizations: doing efficiently all that is necessary with limited resources. (Inman-Frietas, 1991)

School districts across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the economic turndown of the past six years have had to be creative in designing cost saving methods for their schools. Some communities with better resources have been more successful in maintaining services for students while others facing failed overrides and diminishing resources have had to reduce services and personnel in their schools. It is our contention that legislatively forced consolidation such as has been implemented recently in our neighboring state of Maine (and strongly contested) is not the answer for Massachusetts. However it is incumbent upon every district in Massachusetts to do everything within its power to operate more efficiently and economically given the current fiscal realities. These efforts need to be in partnership with the state so that the end product will be an excellent and equitable education for all students.

Schools across the state are involved in a number of collaborative arrangements to allow the better use of resources. The educational collaboratives, although not consistent in their missions, do offer many services that their participating school systems may use. The most consistent service is in special education programming for low-incidence populations; professional development planning is another. Some also focus on technology and transportation. These structures should be re-examined and enhanced, with the goal of forging true partnerships with district leadership. The state can be of assistance in directing grant funds for this purpose.

Voluntary inter-local compacts between neighboring schools for the purpose of sharing such needs as specialized teachers (music, art, foreign language, OT, PT), cooperative purchasing, management support systems, technology, data collection, sports teams, distance learning, curriculum offerings, transportation, and grant writing can be developed where these services might not otherwise be available through collaboratives or other consortiums. The state could take a helpful role by providing financial and technical assistance for the development and implementation of these compacts.

Technology could be utilized better to assist with collaboration. An electronic, web-based clearing house as kind of a virtual collaborative could be created to assist districts in coordinating many of these cost-saving sharing ideas - distance learning, shared professional development opportunities, tips for cost sharing and cost saving, etc., could all be posted and discussed on line. The state could assist by hiring a web master and maintaining the site. The development of regional technological consortiums where smaller districts would have assistance with needs such as data warehousing and data analysis of student assessments can also be supported through the state.

A spirit of cooperation and collaboration as opposed to competition amongst school districts will go much farther in the goal of ensuring the best education possible in the most efficient and effective manner for the children of Massachusetts. With focused assistance and resources from the state to expedite these collaborations, small districts might be able to continue their successes despite economic challenges.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A review of the literature and an analysis of small school district data (student enrollments of 2000 total or less) in Massachusetts indicated that small districts are successful in the education of their students across many domains. Teacher satisfaction is high, parents and community members are involved and committed, and small schools/districts serve an important role in the lives of the communities both socially and economically. Therefore, we feel a concerted effort on the part of the state to preserve and foster these school districts is necessary.

Consolidation, particularly legislatively mandated consolidation, does not appear to be supported by the literature reviewed and can be at cross purposes with what we have learned about the effectiveness of small districts. School district consolidation should not be based solely on the desire to reduce costs (even if finance is a primary motivator, it is important to highlight that many small districts are in fact fiscally viable and that consolidation is unlikely to lead to any prolonged savings). Such efforts need to be voluntarily initiated by the communities affected and citizen support is essential. The Chapter 70 formula needs to be revisited. We support the efforts of the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents and the Massachusetts Association of School Committees to create an updated foundation formula to adequately support school districts of all sizes. In that process, the needs of small school districts should be addressed. Financial interventions utilized in other state's funding formulas, such as the following, could be considered:

1. Voluntary inter-local compacts should be actively pursued as an alternative to consolidation. Such compacts can assist schools in collaborating on a variety of cost sharing methods.
2. The educational collaboratives should take a bigger role in designing and maintaining structures of collaboration and greater fiscal efficiencies for schools.
3. Technology should be better utilized to assist with collaboration. An electronic web-based clearing house as a kind of virtual collaborative could be created with support from the commonwealth to assist districts in coordinating many cost sharing ideas such as distance learning, shared professional development, data collection and analysis.

4. Consolidation efforts should not be legislatively forced. The research is clear that many of those efforts in other states have not shown positive results. However, the state could take a bigger role in providing resources for voluntary collaboration between districts.

CONCLUSIONS

Small school districts work! Our findings indicated that students in small Massachusetts school districts outperform students in larger districts. In times of increasing accountability and diminishing resources, educators and policy makers need to stay focused on what makes schools successful.

Efficiency must be more broadly measured in addition to economic measures; other indicators must be used as metrics of efficiency. To begin, student performance data, teacher mobility and retention, and parental support should be included as indicators of success.

There needs to be a movement from deficit to assets thinking: Rather than using deficit models (for example- financial resources) to make legislative decisions, assets of successful school districts should be explored and replicated. Currently, too many decisions are based on what is not working. Building on the findings of this report, research should explore the specific programmatic, leadership, pedagogical, and structural elements that make small school districts in Massachusetts successful.

A spirit of collaboration, not competition, between districts can result in better and more efficient delivery of services to students.

Many challenges lie ahead for students and the teachers, state, and communities who provide their education. Through thoughtful, well researched, and inclusive planning, we can create the schools the children of Massachusetts need and deserve.

References

- Barker R.G., & Gump, P. V. (1964). *Big school, small school: high school size and student behavior*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bickel, R. (1999). School Size, socioeconomic status, and achievement: A Texas replication of inequity in education with a single-unit school addendum,. *Marshall University, Huntington WV, Ed 433 986*.
- Bowen, S. L. (2007). Is bigger that much better? school district size, high school completion, and post secondary enrollment rates in Maine. *The Maine View- Maine Heritage Policy Center, October*.
- Common Core of Data (CCD). (2003-04).
- Cotton, K. (1996). School size, school climate, and student performance. *Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory(close-up #20 School Improvement Research series)*.
- Cotton, K. (2001). New small learning communities: Findings from recent literature. *Northwest Regional Educational Lab*.
- Eyre, E., and Finn, Scott. (2002). Closing costs- school consolidation in West Virginia, series on the costs of school consolidation *August 25 and 30, September 8,12,24, and 29 and October 3, and 6*.
- Fox, W. (1980). *Relationships between size of schools and school districts and the cost of education*. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington,D.C.(Ed 187 029)
- Greene, J. P., and Winters, M.A. (2005). The effect of residential school choice on public high school graduation rates. *Educational working Paper, No 9 -the Manhattan Institute, New York*.
- Gritter, A., & Silvernail, D., and Sloan,James. (2007). Analysis of the impact of school consolidation on student transportation costs. *Center for Educational Policy, Applied Research and Evaluation, University of Southern Maine*.
- Haller, E. J., Monk, D. H., Spotted Bear, A., Griffith, J., & Moss, P. (1990). School size and program comprehensiveness: Evidence from high school and beyond. *Educational and Policy analysis, 12(2), 109-120*.
- Hamilton, S. F. (1983). Synthesis of research on the social side of schooling. *Educational Leadership, 40(5)*.
- Hirsch, W. Z. (1960). Determinants of public education expenditure. *National Tax Journal, 13(1), 29-40*.
- Inman-Frietas, D. (1991). Efficient financial management in rural Schools: Common problems and solutions from the field. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, ED335206*.
- Jewell, R. W. (1989). School and school district size relationships. *Education and Urban Society, Feb. , 140-153*.
- Jimerson, L. (2006). The hobbit effect: Why small works in public schools. *Rural School and Community Trust, Arlington , Virginia(Rural Trust Policy Brief Series on Rural Education)*.
- Johnson, J., Ed.D. (2006). An investigation of school closures resulting from forced district reorganization in Arkansas. *Rural and School Community Trust*.
- Kennedy, R. L., & al, e. (1989). Expenditures,MAT6 scores and dropout rates: A Correlational study of Arkansas school districts. *ERIC Digest., ED303910(January)*.
- Klonsky, M. (2002). How smaller schools prevent school violence. *Educational Leadership, 59(5), 65-69*.
- Langdon. (2000). The school consolidation plague. *American Enterprise, 11(1)*.
- Lawrence. B.K. et al. (2002). The cost effectiveness of small schools. *Dollars and Sense*.

- Lee, V. E., & Loeb, S. (2000). Small is beautiful: Innovation from the inside out. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 550-554.
- Lipsomb, N. E. (2005). Secondary school extracurricular involvement and academic achievement: A fixed effects approach. *Economics of Education Review*.
- Lumsden, L. (1998). Teacher morale. *Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management-eugenr Oregon college of Education, ERIC Digest 120*(ED 422 601).
- Lyson, T. A. (2002). What does a school mean to a community? Assessing the social and economic benefits of schools to rural villages in New York. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 17(3), 131-137.
- MahoneyJ & Cairns, R. (1997). Do extracurricular activities protect against early school dropout? *Developmental Psychology*, 33(2), 141-253.
- Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: D. Van Nostrand company.
- Massachusetts Department of Education. (2008). *Preliminary report on current fiscal conditions in Massachusetts school districts*.
- Matthews,D.(2008). The public and the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(8), 560-564.
- Meier, D. W. (1996). The big benefits of smallness. *Educational Leadership*, 54:1, 12-15.
- Meier, D. W. (1998). Can the odds be changed?, *In small schools, big imaginations: A creative look at urban public schools, edited by M. Fine and J.I. Somerville. Chicago,Il: .*
- Meier, D. W. (2002). Just let us be: The genesis of a small public school. *Educational Leadership*, 59(5), 76-79.
- Monk, D., & Halber, Emile. (2004). Organizational alternatives for small rural schools *Rural Schools Association*.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2000). Violence in US public schools: 2000 survey on crime and safety. *Statistical Analysis Report: U.S. Department of Education*.
- New York Times. (Dec 30, 1994). What can be done about the scourge of violence among juveniles? the experts on different fronts of the battlefield discuss strategies. . *The New York Times*.
- O'Brien E. & Rollefson, M. (1995). Extracurricular participation and student engagement. *Education Policy Issues: Statistical Perspectives, Washington D.C National Center for Educational Statistics*(June).
- Raywid, M. A. (1999). Current literature on small schools. *Eric Digest. ERIC clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, ED 425 049*.
- Roelke, C. (1996). Curriculum adequacy and quality in high schools enrolling fewer than 400 pupils (9-12). *Eric Digest. ERIC clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools*(ED401090).
- Rural School and Community Trust. (2002). *Closing costs*.
- Rural School and Community Trust. (2003). The fiscal impacts of school consolidation. *Rural Policy Matters*.
- Rural School and Community Trust. (2006 March). Anything but research-based-state initiatives to consolidate schools and districts. *Rural Policy Matters*, 8(3).
- Schlechty , P. C. (2008). No community left behind. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(8).
- Strategic Planning Study Group Committee Louisiana Department of Education. (2003). *Small school districts and economies of scale*.
- Streifel, L., Iatarola, P., Fruchter, N., & Berne, R. (1998). The effects of size of student body on school costs and performance in New York city high schools. *Institute for Education and Social Policy: New York University*.
- Toenjes, L. A. (1989). Dropout rates in Texas school districts: influences of school size and ethnic Group. *Texas Center for Education Research, Austin ,TX, ED 324 783*.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *An overview of smaller learning communities in high schools*. Valencia, R. R. (1984). School closures and policy issues. *ERIC No. ED323040, Policy Paper No. 84*.

- Wasley, P., Fine, M., Holland, N., King, S., Mosak, E., & Powell, L. (2000). *Small schools; great strides-a study of new small schools in Chicago*. New York
- Williams, D. T. (1990). *The dimensions of education: Recent research on school size*. Clemson, SC: Strom Thurman Institute of Government and Public Affairs, Clemson University
- Yan, W. (2006). Is bigger better? A comparison of rural school districts. *Center for Rural Pennsylvania*.

Appendix A – Small Districts Configuration

LEA	Elem. K-2	Elem. K-3	Elem. K-4	Elem. K-5	Elem. K-6	Elem. K-7	Elem. K-8	Middle 3-	Middle 4-	Middle 5-	Middle 5-	Middle 5-	H.S. 5-12	Middle 6-	Middle 7-	H.S. 6-12	H.S. 7-12	H.S. 8-12	H.S. 9-12	K-12	Alt. 9-12
Acushnet			1									1									
Adams-Cheshire			2									1							1		
Amherst					4																
Amherst-Pelham															1				1		
Athol-Royalston					5									1					1		1
Avon					1												1				
Ayer				1								1				1					
Berkley			1									1									
Berkshire Hills			1									1							1		
Berlin					1																
Berlin-Boylston																	1				
Boxborough					1																
Boxford					2																
Boylston					1																
Brewster				2																	
Brimfield					1																
Brookfield					1																
Carver				2											1				1		
Chesterfield-Goshen					1																
Clarksburg							1														
Cohasset				2												1					
Concord				2											1						
Concord-Carlisle																			1		
Conway					1																
Deerfield					1																
Douglas	2							1										1			
Dover				1																	
Dover-Sherborn															1				1		
Eastham				1																	
Easthampton			3										1						1		
Edgartown							1														
Erving					1																
Farmington River Reg.					1																
Florida							1														
Freetown			1																		
Freetown-Lakeville													1								
Frontier																			1		
Gateway			5									1							1		
Georgetown				2												1					
Gill-Montague					4										1				1		
Gosnold																				1	
Granby					2												1				
Granville							1														
Greenfield			4									1							1		
Hadley					1																
Halifax					1																
Hampshire																	1				
Hancock						1															

LEA	Elem. K-2	Elem. K-3	Elem. K-4	Elem. K-5	Elem. K-6	Elem. K-7	Elem. K-8	Middle 3-7	Middle 4-8	Middle 5-6	Middle 5-7	Middle 5-8	H.S. 5-12	Middle 6-8	Middle 7-8	H.S. 6-12	H.S. 7-12	H.S. 8-12	H.S. 9-12	K-12	Alt. 9-12
Harvard				1												1					
Harwich				1										1					1		
Hatfield					1												1				
Hawlemont					1																
Holbrook					2												1				
Holland					1																
Hopedale					2												1				
Hull				1										1					1		
Kingston					2																
Lakeville			2																		
Lanesborough					1																
Lee					1												1				
Leicester				2										1					1		
Lenox				1												1					
Leverett					1																
Lincoln							2		1										1		
Lincoln-Sudbury																			1		
Littleton				2										1					1		
Lunenburg				2										1					1		
Manchester Essex Reg.					2														1		
Marion					1																
Martha's Vineyard																			1		
Mattapoisett					2																
Maynard		1							1										1		
Middleton					2																
Millbury					2												1				
Millis			1									1							1		
Mohawk Trail					4												1				
Monson			1									1							1		
Mount Greylock																	1				
Nahant					1																
Nantuckett				1										1					1		
Narragansett			4									1							1		
Nauset														1					1		
New Salem-Wendell					1																
Norfolk					2																
North Adams				3										1					1		
North Brookfield					1												1				
Northboro-Southboro																			1		
Northborough				4										1							
Oak Bluffs							1														
Old Rochester															1				1		
Orange				2						1											
Orleans				1																	
Palmer			1								1							1			
Pelham					1																
Petersham					1																

LEA	Elem. K-2	Elem. K-3	Elem. K-4	Elem. K-5	Elem. K-6	Elem. K-7	Elem. K-8	Middle 3-7	Middle 4-8	Middle 5-6	Middle 5-7	Middle 5-8	H.S. 5-12	Middle 6-8	Middle 7-8	H.S. 6-12	H.S. 7-12	H.S. 8-12	H.S. 9-12	K-12	Alt. 9-12
Pioneer Valley Reg.					4												1				
Plainville					2																
Provincetown					1												1				
Quabog Reg.					2												1				
Ralph C. Mahar																	1				
Richmond							1														
Rochester					1																
Rockport				1										1					1		
Rowe					1																
Savoy					1																
Sherborn				1																	
Shirley			2									1									
Shutesbury					1																
Silver Lake															1				1		
Southampton					1																
Southborough		3												1							
Southern Berkshire					4												1				
Southwick-Tolland			1									1							1		
Sturbridge					1																
Sunderland					1																
Sutton				2										1					1		
Tantasqua															1				2		
Tisbury							1														
Topsfield					2																
Truro					1																
Up-Island Reg.							2														
Wales					1																
Ware			1								1							1			
Webster					2												1				
Wellfleet					1																
West Boylston				1												1					
West Bridgewater					3												1				
Westhampton					1																
Westport			2									1									
Whately					1																
Williamsburg					2																
Williamstown					1																
Winchenden					2												1				
Wrentham					2																

Appendix B – Small Districts Demographic

LEA	08 Enrollment	Org. Structure	# of Schools	Square Miles	07 Low Income %	Per State Average
Acushnet	1085	6,1	2	18.45	12.2	16.7
Adams-Cheshire	1652	2	4	44.98	32.6	(3.7)
Amherst	1448	3	4	27.72	28.0	0.9
Amherst-Pelham	1857	2	2	52.79	16.7	12.2
Athol-Royalston	1954	2	8	74.46	39.3	(10.4)
Avon	761	6	2	4.38	27.7	1.2
Ayer	1270	6	3	9.02	23.1	5.8
Berkley	990	6,1	2	16.54	6.3	22.6
Berkshire Hills	1469	2	3	86.6	15.8	13.1
Berlin	226	3	1	12.93	3.1	25.8
Berlin-Boylston	488	2	1	28.85	5.5	23.4
Boxborough	543	6	1	10.36	1.8	27.1
Boxford	974	3	2	23.97	0.5	28.4
Boylston	377	3	1	16.03	2.7	26.2
Brewster	480	3	2	22.98	13.8	15.1
Brimfield	369	3	1	34.71	8.1	20.8
Brookfield	277	3	1	15.52	19.9	9.0
Carver	1995	6	4	37.55	14.7	14.2
Chesterfield-Goshen	172	2	1	48.47	15.7	13.2
Clarksburg	199	3,1	1	12.76	25.1	3.8
Cohasset	1489	6	3	9.89	2.2	26.7
Concord	1858	6	3	24.92	3.4	25.5
Concord-Carlisle	1256	2	1	40.28	2.1	26.8
Conway	166	3	1	37.71	16.3	12.6
Deerfield	464	3	1	32.29	12.5	16.4
Douglas	1775	6	4	36.37	8.3	20.6
Dover	593	3	1	15.33	0.5	28.4
Dover-Sherborn	1083	2	2	21.12	0.6	28.3
Eastham	227	3	1	13.99	18.1	10.8
Easthampton	1657	6	5	13.42	24.7	4.2
Edgartown	329	3	1	26.99	14.3	14.6
Erving	183	3, 7	1	13.87	14.2	14.7
Farmington River Reg.	148	2	1	88.28	31.8	(2.9)
Florida	106	3,1	1	24.36	31.1	(2.2)
Freetown	546	3	1	36.61	10.6	18.3
Freetown-Lakeville	1925	2	1	66.51	7.5	21.4
Frontier	714	2	1	105.20	12.7	16.2
Gateway	1337	2	7	204.59	27.2	1.7
Georgetown	1738	6	3	12.94	3.9	25.0
Gill-Montague	1179	2	6	44.38	42.8	(13.9)
Gosnold	2	6,7	6,7	13.34		28.9
Granby	1145	6	3	27.86	14.0	14.9
Granville	225	6,7	1	42.24	10.7	18.2
Greenfield	1817	6	6	21.73	55.3	(26.4)
Hadley	652	6	2	23.31	12.0	16.9

	08 Enrollment	Org. Structure	# of Schools	Square Miles	07 Low Income %	Per State Average
Halifax	724	3	1	16.15	6.2	22.7
Hampshire	814	2	1	129.54	6.4	22.5
Hancock	44	3,7	1	35.73	13.6	15.3
Harvard	1338	6	2	26.36	1.0	27.9
Harwich	1399	6	3	21.04	16.2	12.7
Hatfield	443	6	2	16.02	11.1	17.8
Hawlemont	117	2	1	56.96	40.2	(11.3)
Holbrook	1384	6	3	7.35	24.6	4.3
Holland	270	3	1	34.99	21.5	7.4
Hopedale	1328	6	3	12.39	4.5	24.4
Hull	1235	6	3	3.03	21.8	7.1
Kingston	1150	3	2	18.53	6.4	22.5
Lakeville	765	3	2	29.90	4.7	24.2
Lanesborough	299	3	1	29.04	13.4	15.5
Lee	890	6	2	26.40	27.8	1.1
Leicester	1931	6	4	23.36	14.6	14.3
Lenox	837	6	2	21.22	5.9	23.0
Leverett	171	3	1	22.85	19.3	9.6
Lincoln	1227	6	3	14.37	10.8	18.1
Lincoln-Sudbury	1613	2	1	38.74	4.1	24.8
Littleton	1555	6	4	16.62	2.8	26.1
Lunenburg	1844	6	4	26.42	8.2	20.7
Manchester Essex Reg.	1315	2	3	23.45	6.0	22.9
Marion	450	3	1	14.63	6.0	22.9
Martha's Vineyard	791	2	1	93.18	14.5	14.4
Mattapoisett	499	3	2	16.48	7.4	21.5
Maynard	1366	6	3	5.24	14.3	14.6
Middleton	864	3	2	13.97	3.8	25.1
Millbury	1952	6	3	15.73	17.6	11.3
Millis	1320	6	3	12.16	13.0	15.9
Mohawk Trail	1271	2	5	229.85	29.7	(0.8)
Monson	1553	6	3	44.28	14.1	14.8
Mount Greylock	632	2	1	75.69	13.6	15.3
Nahant	215	6,7	1	1.24	6.0	22.9
Nantuckett	1308	6	3	47.81	7.5	21.4
Narragansett	1726	2	6	56.30	20.0	8.9
Nauset	1662	2	2	92.02	10.3	18.6
New Salem-Wendell	159	2,3	1	76.69	35.8	(6.9)
Norfolk	1088	6	2	14.84	3.6	25.3
North Adams	1789	6	5	20.44	46.1	(17.2)
North Brookfield	720	6	2	21.06	26.0	2.9
Northboro-Southboro	1392	2	1	22.68	2.7	26.2
Northborough	1889	3	5	18.53	3.8	25.1

LEA	08 Enrollment	Org. Structure	# of Schools	Square Miles	07 Low Income %	Per State Average
Oak Bluffs	421	3	1	7.37	13.8	15.1
Old Rochester	1238	2	2	65.04	6.5	22.4
Orange	792	6	3	35.36	42.0	(13.1)
Orleans	199	3	1	14.17	12.6	16.3
Palmer	1993	6	3	31.53	33.7	(4.8)
Pelham	125	3	1	25.07	8.0	20.9
Petersham	125	6	1	54.24	16.0	12.9
Pioneer Valley Reg.	1112	2	5	112.92	20.0	8.9
Plainville	847	6	2	11.06	10.2	18.7
Provincetown	212	6	2	9.66	25.5	3.4
Quabog Reg.	1495	2	3	48.00	25.1	3.8
Ralph C. Mahar	747	2	1	165.99	42.2	(13.3)
Richmond	178	3,1	1	18.96	5.1	23.8
Rochester	587	3	1	33.93	6.1	22.8
Rockport	1038	6	3	7.07	13.7	15.2
Rowe	63	6,7	1	24.07	38.1	(9.2)
Savoy	62	3,8	1	35.86	3.2	25.7
Sherborn	476	3	1	15.96	1.1	27.8
Shirley	655	6,1	3	15.82	27.0	1.9
Shutesbury	155	3	1	26.61	7.1	21.8
Silver Lake	1830	2	2	49.47	8.6	20.3
Southampton	538	3	1	28.15	8.7	20.2
Southborough	1598	3	4	14.15	1.7	27.2
Southern Berkshire	860	2	5	152.56	18.1	10.8
Southwick-Tolland	1904	2	3	62.60	13.5	15.4
Sturbridge	876	3	1	37.41	6.7	22.2
Sunderland	218	3	1	14.39	20.2	8.7
Sutton	1682	6	4	32.38	5.9	23.0
Tantasqua	1880	2	3	117.00	10.9	18.0
Tisbury	310	3	1	6.56	18.7	10.2
Topsfield	694	3	2	12.74	0.6	28.3
Truro	122	6,7	1	21.05	21.3	7.6
Up-Island Reg.	329	2	2	52.06	4.9	24.0
Wales	178	3	1	15.75	19.1	9.8
Ware	1248	6	3	34.41	46.2	(17.3)
Webster	1995	6	3	12.49	41.0	(12.1)
Wellfleet	131	3	1	19.83	9.9	19.0
West Boylston	1122	6	2	12.90	9.0	19.9
West Bridgewater	1220	6	4	15.74	38.3	(9.4)
Westhampton	149	3	1	27.14	14.1	14.8
Westport	1923	6	3	50.05	14.1	14.8
Whately	124	3	1	20.18	12.7	16.2

Wellfleet	131	3	1	19.83	9.9	19.0
West Boylston	1122	6	2	12.90	9.0	19.9

Wellfleet	131	3	1	19.83	9.9	19.0
West Boylston	1122	6	2	12.90	9.0	19.9
West Bridgewater	1220	6	4	15.74	38.3	(9.4)
Westhampton	149	3	1	27.14	14.1	14.8
Westport	1923	6	3	50.05	14.1	14.8
Whately	124	3	1	20.18	12.7	16.2
Williamsburg	159	3	2	25.63	20.1	8.8
Williamstown	461	6	1	46.89	12.4	16.5
Winchenden	1684	6	3	43.28	28.3	0.6
Wrentham	1227	6	2	22.20	4.7	24.2

Organizational Structure Key:

1 - Tuitions to Other District, 9-12

2 - Academic Region

3 - Supervisory Union

4 - Vocational Region

5 - County Agricultural

6 - Local District

7 - Tuitions to Other District, 7-12

8 - Tuitions to Other District, 6-12

9 - Independent Vocational School

Appendix C - Small Districts Teacher Indicators

LEA	07 % Highly Qualified Teacher	Per State Average	07 Pupil per 1 Teacher	Per State Average
Acushnet	100.0	4.9	14.6	1.4
Adams-Cheshire	99.4	4.3	13.7	0.5
Amherst	99.0	3.9	10.8	(2.4)
Amherst-Pelham	97.0	1.9	12.1	(1.1)
Athol-Royalston	96.4	1.3	12.9	(0.3)
Avon	88.3	(6.8)	13.4	0.2
Ayer	97.8	2.7	12.6	(0.6)
Berkley	88.5	(6.6)	14.3	1.1
Berkshire Hills	95.6	0.5	10.7	(2.5)
Berlin	100.0	4.9	10.2	(3.0)
Berlin-Boylston	100.0	4.9	13.6	0.4
Boxborough	99.5	4.4	12.9	(0.3)
Boxford	99.9	4.8	12.8	(0.4)
Boylston	98.1	3.0	13.4	0.2
Brewster	100.0	4.9	10.2	(3.0)
Brimfield	100.0	4.9	11.9	(1.3)
Brookfield	95.6	0.5	11.4	(1.8)
Carver	91.6	(3.5)	13.7	0.5
Chesterfield-Goshen	86.9	(8.2)	12.7	(0.5)
Clarksburg	100.0	4.9	12.7	(0.5)
Cohasset	100.0	4.9	14.4	1.2
Concord	99.9	4.8	11.6	(1.6)
Concord-Carlisle	98.3	3.2	13.3	0.1
Conway	82.8	(12.3)	12.2	(1.0)
Deerfield	100.0	4.9	12.0	(1.2)
Douglas	97.3	2.2	16.5	3.3
Dover	100.0	4.9	14.0	0.8
Dover-Sherborn	99.3	4.2	10.5	(2.7)
Eastham	100.0	4.9	9.8	(3.4)
Easthampton	97.4	2.3	12.0	(1.2)
Edgartown	83.7	(11.4)	10.9	(2.3)
Erving	100.0	4.9	12.1	(1.1)
Farmington River Reg.	100.0	4.9	8.3	(4.9)
Florida	84.6	(10.5)	8.5	(4.7)
Freetown	100.0	4.9	16.8	3.6
Freetown-Lakeville	99.4	4.3	14.5	1.3
Frontier	100.0	4.9	11.4	(1.8)
Gateway	97.9	2.8	12.4	(0.8)

LEA	07 % Highly Qualified Teachers	Per State Average	07 Pupil per 1 Teacher	Per State Average
Georgetown	99.0	3.9	15.4	2.2
Gill-Montague	89.6	(5.5)	12.4	(0.8)
Gosnold	100.0	4.9	2.2	(11.0)
Granby	86.5	(8.6)	12.9	(0.3)
Granville	89.6	(5.5)	10.8	(2.4)
Greenfield	98.7	3.6	12.5	(0.7)
Hadley	100.0	4.9	13.4	0.2
Halifax	97.7	2.6	16.1	2.9
Hampshire	100.0	4.9	12.4	(0.8)
Hancock	100.0	4.9	7.8	(5.4)
Harvard	99.1	4.0	14.3	1.1
Harwich	99.8	4.7	11.7	(1.5)
Hatfield	99.1	4.0	11.9	(1.3)
Hawlemont	96.1	1.0	9.0	(4.2)
Holbrook	88.5	(6.6)	15.8	2.6
Holland	85.6	(9.5)	13.7	0.5
Hopedale	93.4	(1.7)	14.5	1.3
Hull	94.7	(0.4)	11.5	(1.7)
Kingston	96.9	1.8	16.6	3.4
Lakeville	99.3	4.2	16.0	2.8
Lanesborough	100.0	4.9	12.3	(0.9)
Lee	98.1	3.0	11.6	(1.6)
Leicester	98.8	3.7	14.4	1.2
Lenox	93.3	(1.8)	11.7	(1.5)
Leverett	93.3	(1.8)	9.2	(4.0)
Lincoln	96.6	1.5	9.5	(3.7)
Lincoln-Sudbury	96.2	1.1	11.9	(1.3)
Littleton	100.0	4.9	14.3	1.1
Lunenburg	96.1	1.0	14.9	1.7
Manchester Essex Reg.	100.0	4.9	12.0	(1.2)
Marion	100.0	4.9	12.0	(1.2)
Martha's Vineyard	96.0	0.9	14.3	1.1
Mattapoisett	100.0	4.9	11.7	(1.5)
Maynard	100.0	4.9	13.5	0.3
Middleton	100.0	4.9	14.3	1.1
Millbury	99.1	4.0	13.7	0.5
Millis	100.0	4.9	15.4	2.2
Mohawk Trail	98.0	2.9	11.2	(2.0)
Monson	96.2	1.1	14.6	1.4
Mount Greylock	93.2	(1.9)	11.9	(1.3)

LEA	07 % Highly Qualified Teacher	Per State Average	07 Pupil per 1 Teacher	Per State Average
Nahant	100.0	4.9	14.1	0.9
Nantuckett	75.9	(19.2)	10.5	(2.7)
Narragansett	97.3	2.2	16.0	2.8
Nauset	88.7	(6.4)	11.9	(1.3)
New Salem-Wendell	100.0	4.9	12.8	(0.4)
Norfolk	98.7	3.6	13.0	(0.2)
North Adams	85.5	(9.6)	10.3	(2.9)
North Brookfield	97.1	2.0	12.1	(1.1)
Northboro-Southboro	98.3	3.2	14.3	1.1
Northborough	99.2	4.1	13.2	0.0
Oak Bluffs	90.3	(4.8)	8.6	(4.6)
Old Rochester	100.0	4.9	13.8	0.6
Orange	100.0	4.9	12.2	(1.0)
Orleans	100.0	4.9	8.7	(4.5)
Palmer	98.5	3.4	12.6	(0.6)
Pelham	100.0	4.9	12.1	(1.1)
Petersham	95.2	0.1	12.6	(0.6)
Pioneer Valley Reg.	96.8	1.7	12.1	(1.1)
Plainville	98.1	3.0	15.5	2.3
Provincetown	94.6	(0.5)	5.8	(7.4)
Quabog Reg.	92.9	(2.2)	13.5	0.3
Ralph C. Mahar	93.4	(1.7)	12.3	(0.9)
Richmond	100.0	4.9	10.5	(2.7)
Rochester	97.9	2.8	15.7	2.5
Rockport	95.2	0.1	11.4	(1.8)
Rowe	97.5	2.4	7.2	(6.0)
Savoy	100.0	4.9	9.7	(3.5)
Sherborn	100.0	4.9	13.4	0.2
Shirley	100.0	4.9	14.0	0.8
Shutesbury	92.1	(3.0)	10.8	(2.4)
Silver Lake	98.2	3.1	12.7	(0.5)
Southampton	97.1	2.0	13.8	0.6
Southborough	93.5	(1.6)	13.2	0.0
Southern Berkshire	91.9	(3.2)	9.3	(3.9)
Southwick-Tolland	98.7	3.6	14.3	1.1
Sturbridge	96.6	1.5	13.0	(0.2)

LEA	07 % Highly Qualified Teacher	Per State Average	07 Pupil per 1 Teacher	Per State Average
Sunderland	100.0	4.9	10.1	(3.1)
Sutton	91.0	(4.1)	13.7	0.5
Tantasqua	100.0	4.9	13.7	0.5
Tisbury	95.6	0.5	8.7	(4.5)
Topsfield	100.0	4.9	12.7	(0.5)
Truro	100.0	4.9	8.7	(4.5)
Up-Island Reg.	99.0	3.9	8.1	(5.1)
Wales	100.0	4.9	15.6	2.4
Ware	90.7	(4.4)	13.1	(0.1)
Webster	94.6	(0.5)	14.7	1.5
Wellfleet	100.0	4.9	7.4	(5.8)
West Boylston	93.4	(1.7)	12.8	(0.4)
West Bridgewater	99.7	4.6	14.3	1.1
Westhampton	100.0	4.9	12.3	(0.9)
Westport	98.6	3.5	15.1	1.9
Whately	100.0	4.9	12.4	(0.8)
Williamsburg	100.0	4.9	7.9	(5.3)
Williamstown	94.6	(0.5)	11.3	(1.9)
Winchenden	98.2	3.1	12.8	(0.4)
Wrentham	97.7	2.6	15.6	2.4

Appendix D – Small Districts Student Indicators

LEA	07 AYP Status	07 Attendance Rate	Per State Average	06 Drop-out %	Per State Average
Acushnet		96.3	1.7		
Adams-Cheshire		95.0	0.4	6.0	(3.4)
Amherst		94.8	0.2		
Amherst-Pelham	E -Corr. Act. Subgroups, M - Improvement Yr.1 Subgroups	93.6	(1.0)	4.3	(5.1)
Athol-Royalston		93.7	(0.9)	12.2	2.8
Avon		95.3	0.7	1.5	(7.9)
Ayer		94.8	0.2	4.0	(5.4)
Berkley		96.2	1.6		
Berkshire Hills		92.4	(2.2)	11.0	1.6
Berlin		96.1	1.5		
Berlin-Boylston		94.3	(0.3)	4.1	(5.3)
Boxborough		96.9	2.3		
Boxford		96.6	2.0		
Boylston		96.8	2.2		
Brewster		95.0	0.4		
Brimfield		95.5	0.9		
Brookfield		95.8	1.2		
Carver		95.2	0.6	11.8	2.4
Chesterfield-Goshen		95.1	0.5		
Clarksburg		97.0	2.4		
Cohasset		95.9	1.3	0.9	(8.5)
Concord		96.2	1.6		
Concord-Carlisle		95.4	0.8	0.7	(8.7)
Conway		96.0	1.4		
Deerfield		96.0	1.4		
Douglas		95.4	0.8	3.8	(5.6)
Dover		94.8	0.2		
Dover-Sherborn		96.1	1.5	0.7	(8.7)
Eastham		94.2	(0.4)		
Easthampton		94.5	(0.1)	3.9	(5.5)
Edgartown		95.6	1.0		
Erving		95.7	1.1		
Farmington River Reg.		94.2	(0.4)		
Florida		94.9	0.3		
Freetown		95.0	0.4		
Freetown-Lakeville		95.5	0.9	6.1	(3.3)
Frontier		96.6	2.0	5.2	(4.2)
Gateway		94.7	0.1	12.4	3.0
Georgetown		95.1	0.5	2.5	(6.9)
Gill-Montague		94.2	(0.4)	22.7	13.3
Gosnold			(94.6)		
Granby	M - Imp. Yr. 1	96.0	1.4	2.6	(6.8)
Granville		95.8	1.2		
Greenfield	M - Corr. Act. Subgroups	94.1	(0.5)	18.4	9.0
Hadley		95.6	1.0	6.7	(2.7)

LEA	07 AYP Status	07 Attendance Rate	Per State Average	06 Drop-out %	Per State Average
Halifax		95.9	1.3		
Hampshire	M - Corr. Act. Subgroups	95.6	1.0	8.0	(1.4)
Hancock		95.2	0.6		
Harvard		96.0	1.4	5.6	(3.8)
Harwich		94.6	0.0	1.8	(7.6)
Hatfield		96.1	1.5	0.0	(9.4)
Hawlemont		95.0	0.4		
Holbrook		94.6	0.0	11.5	2.1
Holland		95.4	0.8		
Hopedale		96.5	1.9	4.6	(4.8)
Hull		94.4	(0.2)	3.4	(6.0)
Kingston		95.6	1.0		
Lakeville		96.0	1.4		
Lanesborough		96.2	1.6		
Lee		94.4	(0.2)	9.0	(0.4)
Leicester		94.4	(0.2)	7.5	(1.9)
Lenox		95.0	0.4	0.0	(9.4)
Leverett		94.9	0.3		
Lincoln		95.7	1.1		
Lincoln-Sudbury		96.4	1.8	0.8	(8.6)
Littleton		96.0	1.4	1.1	(8.3)
Lunenburg		96.1	1.5	2.7	(6.7)
Manchester Essex Reg.		95.8	1.2	5.7	(3.7)
Marion		95.8	1.2		
Martha's Vineyard		95.0	0.4	4.2	(5.2)
Mattapoisett		96.3	1.7		
Maynard		95.7	1.1	3.8	(5.6)
Middleton		96.8	2.2		
Millbury		95.0	0.4	5.5	(3.9)
Millis		95.9	1.3	0.0	
Mohawk Trail		94.8	0.2	12.6	3.2
Monson		95.7	1.1	5.5	(3.9)
Mount Greylock		93.1	(1.5)	2.9	(6.5)
Nahant		94.8	0.2		
Nantucket		94.5	(0.1)	8.1	(1.3)
Narragansett		95.0	0.4	15.6	6.2
Nauset		93.3	(1.3)	1.3	(8.1)
New Salem-Wendell		92.9	(1.7)		
Norfolk		96.3	1.7		
North Adams		94.0	(0.6)	16.3	6.9
North Brookfield		94.9	0.3	16.7	7.3
Northboro-Southboro		94.5	(0.1)	1.7	(7.7)
Northborough		96.5	1.9		(9.4)

LEA	07 AYP Status	07 Attendance Rate	Per State Average	06 Drop-out %	Per State Average
Oak Bluffs		92.2	(2.4)		
Old Rochester		95.4	0.8	6.3	(3.1)
Orange	E - Impr. Yr. 2 Subgroups	94.7	0.1		
Orleans		95.3	0.7		
Palmer		95.5	0.9	4.9	(4.5)
Pelham		96.5	1.9		
Petersham		94.7	0.1		
Pioneer Valley Reg.		96.6	2.0	9.2	(0.2)
Plainville		96.2	1.6		
Provincetown		93.4	(1.2)	0.0	(9.4)
Quabog Reg.		94.8	0.2	13.6	4.2
Ralph C. Mahar	M - Imp. Yr. 1 Subgroups	93.6	(1.0)	12.5	3.1
Richmond		95.5	0.9		
Rochester		95.9	1.3		
Rockport		95.0	0.4	1.2	
Rowe		93.9	(0.7)		
Savoy		94.1	(0.5)		
Sherborn		97.0	2.4		
Shirley		96.7	2.1		
Shutesbury		95.0	0.4		
Silver Lake		94.3	(0.3)	9.4	0.0
Southampton	M - Imp. Yr. 1 Subgroups	96.6	2.0		
Southborough		96.8	2.2		
Southern Berkshire		94.8	0.2	6.1	(3.3)
Southwick-Tolland		95.5	0.9	6.0	(3.4)
Sturbridge		96.1	1.5		
Sunderland		94.5	(0.1)		
Sutton		95.7	1.1	1.0	(8.4)
Tantasqua		94.4	(0.2)	6.9	(2.5)
Tisbury		95.3	0.7		
Topsfield		96.6	2.0		
Truro		95.5	0.9		
Up-Island Reg.		94.2	(0.4)		
Wales		95.5	0.9		
Ware		92.5	(2.1)	21.3	11.9
Webster		94.2	(0.4)	11.3	1.9
Wellfleet		93.6	(1.0)		
West Boylston		95.6	1.0	2.4	(7.0)
West Bridgewater		95.5	0.9	9.8	0.4
Westhampton	E - Imp. Yr. 1	96.6	2.0		
Westport		94.9	0.3	10.5	1.1
Whately		95.4	0.8		
Williamsburg		95.2	0.6		
Williamstown		95.2	0.6		
Winchenden		94.1	(0.5)	15.5	6.1
Wrentham		96.3	1.7		

Appendix E – Post-Graduation Indicators

LEA	07 Graduation %	Per State Average	4-yr College %	Per State Average	2-yr College %	Per State Average	Other Post-sec. %	Per State Average	% to Work	Per State Average	% to Military	Per State Average	% to Other	Per State Average	% to Unknown	Per State Average
Adams-Cheshire	87.3	6.4	56.0	(2.0)	30.0	9.0	2.0	(1.0)	9.0	(1.0)	1.0	(1.0)	0.0	(1.0)	1.0	(6.0)
Amherst-Pelham	87.2	6.3	78.0	20.0	14.0	(7.0)	0.0	(3.0)	4.0	(6.0)	0.0	(2.0)	1.0	0.0	3.0	(4.0)
Athol-Royalston	66.7	(14.2)	40.0	(18.0)	34.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	(1.0)	6.0	(1.0)
Avon	89.2	8.3	56.0	(2.0)	20.0	(1.0)	6.0	3.0	11.0	1.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	(1.0)	2.0	(5.0)
Ayer	86.0	5.1	61.0	3.0	11.0	(10.0)	4.0	1.0	16.0	6.0	1.0	(1.0)	3.0	2.0	4.0	(3.0)
Berkshire Hills	85.7	4.8	54.0	(4.0)	25.0	4.0	0.0	(3.0)	8.0	(2.0)	0.0	(2.0)	5.0	4.0	9.0	2.0
Berlin-Boylston	93.2	12.3	74.0	16.0	16.0	(5.0)	1.0	(2.0)	4.0	(6.0)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	4.0	(3.0)
Carver	83.5	2.6	57.0	(1.0)	24.0	3.0	2.0	(1.0)	9.0	(1.0)	1.0	(1.0)	0.0	(1.0)	7.0	0.0
Cohasset	97.3	16.4	78.0	20.0	8.0	(13.0)	6.0	3.0	3.0	(7.0)	1.0	(1.0)	2.0	1.0	2.0	(5.0)
Concord-Carlisle	96.4	15.5	95.0	37.0	2.0	(19.0)	1.0	(2.0)	0.0	(10.0)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	2.0	(5.0)
Douglas	92.5	11.6	60.0	2.0	12.0	(9.0)	6.0	3.0	16.0	6.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	(7.0)
Dover-Sherborn	98.6	17.7	96.0	38.0	1.0	(20.0)	0.0	(3.0)	0.0	(10.0)	0.0	(2.0)	3.0	2.0	0.0	(7.0)
Easthampton	84.5	3.6	37.0	(21.0)	41.0	20.0	2.0	(1.0)	10.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	5.0	(2.0)
Freetown-Lakeville	88.2	7.3	54.4	(3.6)	27.7	6.7	4.9	1.9	10.3	0.3	1.1	(0.9)	0.0	(1.0)	1.1	(5.9)
Frontier	85.2	4.3	48.1	(9.9)	36.1	15.1	3.7	0.7	11.1	1.1	0.9	(1.1)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Gateway	77.1	(3.8)	49.0	(9.0)	2.8	(18.2)	4.0	1.0	14.0	4.0	1.0	(1.0)	0.0	(1.0)	4.0	(3.0)
Georgetown	93.3	12.4	70.4	12.4	18.7	(2.3)	0.0	(3.0)	8.8	(1.2)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	2.2	(4.8)
Gill-Montague	69.1	(11.8)	35.4	(22.6)	36.6	15.6	3.7	0.7	9.8	(0.2)	4.0	2.0	0.0	(1.0)	9.8	2.8
Granby	92.3	11.4	49.4	(8.6)	40.3	19.3	1.3	(1.7)	9.1	(0.9)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Greenfield	68.4	(12.5)	37.9	(20.1)	39.8	18.8	4.9	1.9	8.7	(1.3)	2.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	3.9	(3.1)
Hadley	86.7	5.8	65.8	7.8	22.9	1.9	2.9	(0.1)	5.7	(4.3)	0.0	(2.0)	2.9	1.9	0.0	(7.0)
Hampshire	86.2	5.3	53.4	(4.6)	24.8	3.8	6.0	3.0	8.3	(1.7)	2.3	0.3	0.0	(1.0)	5.3	(1.7)
Harvard	91.7	10.8	93.3	35.3	1.1	(19.9)	0.0	(3.0)	1.1	(8.9)	0.0	(2.0)	1.1	0.1	3.4	(3.6)
Harwich	84.4	3.5	66.3	8.3	24.8	3.8	0.0	(3.0)	4.3	(5.7)	1.1	(0.9)	0.0	(1.0)	3.3	(3.7)
Hatfield	96.6	15.7	73.4	15.4	20.0	(1.0)	0.0	(3.0)	3.3	(6.7)	3.3	1.3	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Holbrook	77.0	(3.9)	49.1	(8.9)	15.3	(5.7)	0.0	(3.0)	32.2	22.2	1.7	(0.3)	0.0	(1.0)	1.7	(5.3)
Hopedale	86.2	5.3	81.7	23.7	1.4	(19.6)	4.2	1.2	11.3	1.3	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	1.4	(5.6)
Hull	88.6	7.7	60.5	2.5	10.5	(10.5)	3.9	0.9	7.9	(2.1)	5.3	3.3	0.0	(1.0)	11.8	4.8
Lee	83.3	2.4	36.9	(21.1)	44.1	23.1	1.2	(1.8)	15.5	5.5	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	2.4	(4.6)
Leicester	76.3	(4.6)	65.0	7.0	23.0	2.0	2.0	(1.0)	8.0	(2.0)	1.0	(1.0)	0.0	(1.0)	2.0	(5.0)
Lenox	100.0	19.1	78.8	20.8	18.2	(2.8)	0.0	(3.0)	1.5	(8.5)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Lincoln-Sudbury	96.1	15.2	93.2	35.2	2.1	(18.9)	0.6	(2.4)	2.6	(7.4)	0.3	(1.7)	1.2	0.2	0.0	(7.0)
Littleton	94.3	13.4	49.0	(9.0)	38.5	17.5	4.8	1.8	4.8	(5.2)	1.9	(0.1)	0.0	(1.0)	1.9	(5.1)
Lunenburg	88.7	7.8	56.4	(1.6)	18.0	(3.0)	3.0	0.0	4.5	(5.5)	0.8	(1.2)	0.0	(1.0)	17.3	10.3
Manchester Essex Reg.	93.4	12.5	100.0	42.0	0.0	(21.0)	0.0	(3.0)	0.0	(10.0)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Martha's Vineyard	90.7	9.8	64.0	6.0	12.0	(9.0)	4.0	1.0	14.5	4.5	1.0	(1.0)	3.0	2.0	1.5	(5.5)
Maynard	87.3	6.4	62.5	4.5	21.9	0.9	3.1	0.1	10.9	0.9	1.6	(0.4)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Millbury	87.3	6.4	51.6	(6.4)	30.2	9.2	1.6	(1.4)	7.9	(2.1)	3.2	1.2	5.6	4.6	0.0	(7.0)
Millis	100.0	19.1	72.0	14.0	16.0	(5.0)	2.7	(0.3)	0.0	(10.0)	1.3	(0.7)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Mohawk Trail	80.7	(0.2)	50.6	(7.4)	31.6	10.6	4.2	1.2	9.5	(0.5)	0.0	(2.0)	4.2	3.2	0.0	(7.0)
Monson	87.7	6.8	54.4	(3.6)	30.4	9.4	1.1	(1.9)	12.0	2.0	1.1	(0.9)	1.1	0.1	0.0	(7.0)
Mount Greylock	91.4	10.5	73.2	15.2	10.4	(10.6)	1.7	(1.3)	0.0	(10.0)	1.7	(0.3)	1.7	0.7	11.2	4.2
Nantuckett	86.5	5.6	79.3	21.3	3.4	(17.6)	4.6	1.6	10.3	0.3	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	2.3	(4.7)
Narragansett	77.9	(3.0)	67.9	9.9	24.5	3.5	2.9	(0.1)	8.8	(1.2)	2.0	0.0	3.9	2.9	0.0	(7.0)
Nauset	89.6	8.7	53.6	(4.4)	19.3	(1.7)	3.9	0.9	21.1	11.1	1.4	(0.6)	0.7	(0.3)	0.0	(7.0)
North Adams	72.7	(8.2)	57.0	(1.0)	26.0	5.0	8.3	5.3	11.6	1.6	0.0	(2.0)	2.5	1.5	0.0	(7.0)

LEA	07 Graduation %	Per State Average	4-yr College %	Per State Average	2-yr College %	Per State Average	Other Post-sec. %	Per State Average	% to Work	Per State Average	% to Military	Per State Average	% to Other	Per State Average	% to Unknown	Per State Average
North Brookfield	74.1	(6.8)	54.0	(4.0)	16.0	(5.0)	14.0	11.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	4.0	(3.0)
Northboro-Southboro	96.6	15.7	86.2	28.2	4.8	(16.2)	2.4	(0.6)	5.4	(4.6)	0.3	(1.7)	0.0	(1.0)	1.0	(6.0)
Old Rochester	90.5	9.6	67.9	9.9	15.1	(5.9)	3.6	0.6	8.5	(1.5)	1.2	(0.8)	0.0	(1.0)	3.6	(3.4)
Palmer	86.9	6.0	40.4	(17.6)	32.3	11.3	3.0	0.0	5.1	(4.9)	2.0	0.0	0.0	(1.0)	17.2	10.2
Pioneer Valley Reg.	86.8	5.9	50.7	(7.3)	32.4	11.4	1.4	(1.6)	9.9	(0.1)	2.8	0.8	1.4	0.4	1.4	(5.6)
Provincetown	100.0	19.1	30.0	(28.0)	40.0	19.0	6.7	3.7	20.0	10.0	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	3.3	(3.7)
Quabog Reg.	78.0	(2.9)	49.5	(8.5)	19.8	(1.2)	2.0	(1.0)	19.8	9.8	1.0	(1.0)	0.0	(1.0)	7.9	0.9
Ralph C. Mahar	73.2	(7.7)	46.6	(11.4)	32.9	11.9	1.4	(1.6)	12.3	2.3	4.1	2.1	2.7	1.7	0.0	(7.0)
Rockport	86.6	5.7	60.0	2.0	27.1	6.1	0.0	(3.0)	7.1	(2.9)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	5.7	(1.3)
Silver Lake	85.1	4.2	51.6	(6.4)	16.4	(4.6)	6.8	3.8	19.2	9.2	4.0	2.0	0.4	(0.6)	1.6	(5.4)
Southern Berkshire	85.7	4.8	55.3	(2.7)	17.0	(4.0)	8.5	5.5	14.9	4.9	0.0	(2.0)	2.1	1.1	2.1	(4.9)
Southwick-Tolland	82.0	1.1	50.3	(7.7)	29.1	8.1	2.8	(0.2)	12.1	2.1	3.5	1.5	0.0	(1.0)	2.1	(4.9)
Sutton	93.3	12.4	78.9	20.9	10.6	(10.4)	2.4	(0.6)	7.1	(2.9)	1.2	(0.8)	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Tantasqua	86.2	5.3	40.3	(17.7)	19.8	(1.2)	4.9	1.9	9.7	(0.3)	2.6	0.6	0.0	(1.0)	12.7	5.7
Ware	65.0	(15.9)	48.8	(9.2)	16.9	(4.1)	5.1	2.1	23.7	13.7	3.4	1.4	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
Webster	79.6	(1.3)	44.9	(13.1)	26.6	5.6	1.0	(2.0)	22.4	12.4	4.1	2.1	0.0	(1.0)	1.0	(6.0)
West Boylston	90.2	9.3	69.1	11.1	22.2	1.2	4.9	1.9	0.0	(10.0)	3.7	1.7	0.0	(1.0)	0.0	(7.0)
West Bridgewater	86.6	5.7	67.8	9.8	23.7	2.7	1.7	(1.3)	3.4	(6.6)	0.0	(2.0)	0.0	(1.0)	3.4	(3.6)
Westport	82.5	1.6	43.4	(14.6)	27.8	6.8	3.3	0.3	11.1	1.1	2.2	0.2	0.0	(1.0)	2.2	(4.8)
Winchenden	70.0	(10.9)	48.9	(9.1)	33.7	12.7	3.1	0.1	13.3	3.3	3.1	1.1	0.0	(1.0)	1.0	(6.0)

Appendix F– Small Districts Financial Indicators

LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Required	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Required	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of State Average	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Acushnet	\$19,432,527	103.4			\$8,788	78.39%	(\$3,217)
Adams-Cheshire	\$15,485,978	113.8			\$10,234	91.29%	\$21,820
Amherst	\$20,017,863	174.1			\$13,776	122.89%	(\$204,676)
Amherst-Pelham	\$24,199,097	134.4			\$14,292	127.49%	\$669,337
Athol-Royalston	\$19,053,139	107.6			\$10,164	90.67%	(\$1,091,953)
Avon	\$6,548,953	113.4			\$10,328	92.13%	\$1,041,542
Ayer	\$11,757,007	114.7			\$10,151	90.55%	\$950,545
Berkley	\$9,257,491	109.4			\$7,748	69.12%	(\$27,891)
Berkshire Hills	\$18,054,921	140.6			\$13,849	123.54%	\$904,693
Berlin	\$2,861,157	150.7			\$11,799	105.25%	\$40,817
Berlin-Boylston	\$4,855,175	125.3			\$12,545	111.91%	\$536,544
Boxborough	\$5,649,502	125.4			\$10,869	96.96%	(\$4,725)
Boxford	\$8,316,704	126.1			\$9,383	83.70%	N
Boylston	\$3,522,128	121.8			\$10,038	89.55%	\$81,287
Brewster	\$6,569,990	150.1			\$13,516	120.57%	(\$114,661)
Brimfield	\$3,113,221	139.7			\$11,324	101.02%	(\$4,764)
Brookfield	\$2,998,907	139.7			\$11,057	98.64%	(\$19,771)
Carver	\$19,255,291	122.8			\$9,919	88.48%	(\$3,641)
Chesterfield-Goshen	\$1,532,214	106.2			\$8,964	79.96%	\$40,673
Clarksburg	\$2,062,644	101.6			\$10,875	97.01%	\$74,937
Cohasset	\$14,009,258	124.5			\$10,703	95.48%	N
Concord	\$25,925,589	149.5			\$14,411	128.55%	(\$2,900)
Concord-Carlisle	\$17,193,704	127.0			\$15,424	137.59%	N
Conway	\$1,639,770	143.9			\$12,635	112.71%	\$83,185
Deerfield	\$3,927,852	138.4			\$10,489	93.57%	\$461,966
Douglas			\$11,213,175	106.3	\$7,732	68.97%	\$124,670
Dover	\$7,685,002	141.3			\$13,298	118.63%	N
Dover-Sherborn			\$14,133,505	149.3	\$15,559	138.80%	N
Eastham	\$3,513,989	159.6			\$15,706	140.11%	(\$40,000)
Easthampton	\$17,177,647	113.3			\$10,079	89.91%	(\$640,109)
Edgartown	\$6,498,144	177.1			\$16,761	149.52%	(\$136,717)
Erving	\$3,070,268	155.3			\$12,251	109.29%	(\$184,865)
Farmington River Reg.	\$2,909,838	113.3			\$12,094	107.89%	(\$57,581)
Florida			\$967,520	118.4	\$10,209	91.07%	(\$20,900)
Freetown			\$5,426,874	126.5	\$9,958	88.83%	(\$3,100)
Freetown-Lakeville	\$16,788,080	106.7			\$9,503	84.77%	(\$29,573)
Frontier	\$8,134,474	129.5			\$13,218	117.91%	\$389,017
Gateway	\$13,375,038	117.4			\$10,442	93.15%	(\$162,733)

LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Required	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Required	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of State Average	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Georgetown	\$11,877,505	106.9			\$7,680	68.51%	(\$24,073)
Gill-Montague	\$13,996,471	123.1			\$12,818	114.34%	(\$380,322)
Gosnold						0.00%	N
Granby	\$8,430,587	104.3			\$8,744	78.00%	\$451,591
Granville	\$3,009,087	120.7			\$9,970	88.94%	(\$38,769)
Greenfield	\$20,291,107	110.7			\$12,120	108.12%	(\$1,225,586)
Hadley	\$5,980,886	101.2			\$9,856	87.92%	(\$3,934)
Halifax	\$6,399,109	123.6			\$8,548	76.25%	N
Hampshire	\$8,170,116	119.9			\$9,983	89.05%	\$165,916
Hancock			\$1,174,966	137.6	\$9,588	85.53%	(\$51,341)
Harvard	\$2,544,578	127.0			\$10,782	96.18%	\$415,727
Harwich	\$11,048,961	130.6			\$11,428	101.94%	(\$400,635)
Hatfield	\$4,451,998	122.1			\$9,276	82.75%	(\$44,380)
Hawlemont	\$1,336,040	120.4			\$12,181	108.66%	(\$8,855)
Holbrook			\$11,617,612	141.4	\$9,478	84.55%	(\$35,630)
Holland			\$2,194,588	133.7	\$9,107	81.24%	\$63,881
Hopedale	\$2,219,502	128.6			\$8,665	77.30%	\$301,868
Hull	\$15,832,166	120.5			\$12,484	111.36%	N
Kingston	\$9,633,595	114.3			\$8,826	78.73%	N
Lakeville	\$6,183,316	119.1			\$7,760	69.22%	(\$9,735)
Lanesborough			\$3,134,219	148.2	\$11,412	101.80%	\$161,265
Lee	\$7,697,510	112.4			\$10,746	95.86%	\$206,145
Leicester	\$15,832,166	103.7			\$9,058	80.80%	\$67,086
Lenox	\$9,391,732	136.0			\$11,948	106.58%	\$557,015
Leverett	\$1,794,914	168.3			\$12,384	110.47%	\$195,057
Lincoln			\$9,207,610	149.1	\$15,651	139.62%	N
Lincoln-Sudbury	\$20,014,613	143.7			\$13,546	120.84%	N
Littleton			\$14,818,360	123.9	\$10,445	93.18%	(\$62,471)
Lunenburg	\$14,561,883	113.8			\$9,106	81.23%	\$195,488
Manchester Essex Reg.	\$14,629,521	136.5			\$12,436	110.94%	\$584,852
Marion	\$4,451,578	135.4			\$10,799	96.33%	N
Martha's Vineyard	\$13,088,857	121.3			\$17,706	157.95%	N
Mattapoisett	\$5,733,493	150.6			\$11,876	105.94%	N
Maynard	\$2,822,480	125.8			\$11,496	102.55%	(\$22,323)
Middleton	\$7,156,951	130.8			\$10,194	90.94%	(\$886)
Millbury	\$17,865,709	116.1			\$9,830	87.69%	(\$93,310)
Millis	\$11,081,119	116.3			\$8,660	77.25%	(\$13,353)
Mohawk Trail			\$14,557,785	126.3	\$13,330	118.91%	\$93,508
Monson	\$12,000,128	100.4			\$8,454	75.41%	(\$101,817)
Mount Greylock			\$7,522,197	120.1	\$14,202	126.69%	\$195,446

LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Required	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Required	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of State Average	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Nahant	\$3,427,199	104.3			\$9,380	83.68%	(\$5,000)
Mount Greylock			\$7,522,197	120.1	\$14,202	126.69%	\$195,446
Nantuckett			\$21,169,215	163.6	\$18,564	165.60%	N
Narragansett	\$13,480,540	114.9			\$8,236	73.47%	\$153,206
Nauset	\$18,777,226	109.4			\$11,092	98.95%	N
New Salem-Wendell	\$1,579,912	134.6			\$11,734	104.67%	\$9,724
Norfolk	\$10,293,618	128.0			\$10,310	91.97%	(\$6,044)
North Adams	\$20,301,797	120.1			\$12,890	114.99%	(\$358,825)
North Brookfield	\$6,903,457	103.9			\$10,669	95.17%	(\$223,247)
Northboro-Southboro			\$12,527,124	134.6	\$11,484	102.44%	(\$25,880)
Northborough	\$18,560,723	135.9			\$9,931	88.59%	(\$5,000)
Oak Bluffs	\$6,524,461	198.2			\$15,094	134.65%	\$68,766
Old Rochester	\$12,571,225	130.8			\$11,837	105.59%	(\$20,600)
Orange			\$6,527,555	108.5	\$10,175	90.77%	\$245,415
Orleans	\$3,708,375	171.2			\$16,280	145.23%	N
Palmer	\$18,093,939	110.9			\$10,026	89.44%	(\$129,796)
Pelham	\$1,316,193	162.8			\$11,659	104.01%	\$299,834
Petersham	\$1,122,797	126.5			\$9,105	81.22%	\$24,454
Pioneer Valley Reg.	\$11,155,211	136.6			\$11,593	103.42%	\$546,404
Plainville	\$7,219,240	119.5			\$9,132	81.46%	N
Provincetown	\$4,648,334	209.4			\$22,663	202.17%	\$148,539
Quabog Reg.			\$11,700,107	105.0	\$8,735	77.92%	N
Ralph C. Mahar	\$9,953,151	143.9			\$12,444	111.01%	(\$437,269)
Richmond			\$2,808,506	117.0	\$12,065	107.63%	\$123,034
Rochester	\$4,784,307	123.5			\$9,376	83.64%	N
Rockport	\$11,208,764	128.6			\$11,019	98.30%	\$409,040
Rowe	\$1,235,805	185.7			\$18,163	162.02%	\$83,545
Savoy			\$871,707	114.8	\$7,990	71.28%	(\$76,277)
Sherborn	\$5,396,159	144.4			\$11,558	103.10%	N
Shirley	\$7,617,071	104.4			\$9,906	88.37%	(\$294,184)
Shutesbury			\$1,727,311	142.7	\$12,427	110.86%	(\$42,160)
Silver Lake	\$16,984,007	122.5			\$11,359	101.33%	N
Southampton	\$4,858,594	107.5			\$8,986	80.16%	\$147,059
Southborough	\$16,158,496	140.7			\$10,231	91.27%	(\$11,616)
Southern Berkshire		120.9	\$10,804,533		\$12,354	110.21%	(\$306,166)
Southwick-Tolland	\$14,692,105	106.4			\$8,552	76.29%	\$236,855
Sturbridge	\$7,969,556	144.5			\$10,983	97.98%	(\$20,625)

LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Required	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Required	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of State Average	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Sunderland	\$2,346,084	148.0			\$12,134	108.24%	\$101,251
Sutton	\$13,215,634	108.1			\$8,708	77.68%	\$207,922
Tantasqua	\$16,097,847	99.8			\$9,826	87.65%	\$456,750
Tisbury	\$5,771,005	163.3			\$16,326	145.64%	\$4,136
Topsfield	\$6,246,762	134.1			\$9,335	83.27%	(\$2,500)
Truro	\$3,889,551	157.4			\$16,444	146.69%	(\$15,127)
Up-Island Reg.	\$7,338,327	182.6			\$18,462	164.69%	\$63,815
Wales	\$1,602,889	137.4			\$10,666	95.15%	\$3,550
Ware	\$12,633,794	104.6			\$10,836	96.66%	(\$566,060)
Webster	\$17,138,731	104.3			\$10,543	94.05%	(\$166,163)
Wellfleet	\$2,409,301	160.9			\$17,463	155.78%	(\$21,253)
West Boylston	\$10,223,969	123.7			\$9,731	86.81%	\$452,657
West Bridgewater	\$9,736,365	117.9			\$9,716	86.67%	\$838,152
Westhampton	\$1,417,671	120.9			\$9,340	83.32%	(\$23,982)
Westport	\$14,842,112	101.5			\$9,187	81.95%	\$100,638
Whately	\$1,448,811	157.3			\$12,460	111.15%	\$22,285
Williamsburg	\$1,919,782	118.2			\$10,578	94.36%	\$139,624
Williamstown	\$4,627,754	117.7			\$11,398	101.68%	\$301,856
Winchenden	\$14,552,729	99.7			\$10,231	91.27%	(\$485,297)
Wrentham	\$9,263,836	108.5			\$8,796	78.47%	(\$9,618)

Appendix G – Small Academic Regional LEA's Financial Indicators

Academic Regional LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Required	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Required	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of State Average	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Adams-Cheshire	\$15,485,978	113.8			\$10,234	91.29%	\$21,820
Amherst-Pelham	\$24,199,097	134.4			\$14,292	127.49%	\$669,337
Athol-Royalston	\$19,053,139	107.6			\$10,164	90.67%	(\$1,091,953)
Berkshire Hills	\$18,054,921	140.6			\$13,849	123.54%	\$904,693
Berlin-Boylston	\$4,855,175	125.3			\$12,545	111.91%	\$536,544
Chesterfield-Goshen	\$1,532,214	106.2			\$8,964	79.96%	\$40,673
Concord-Carlisle	\$17,193,704	127.0			\$15,424	137.59%	N
Dover-Sherborn			\$14,133,505	149.3	\$15,559	138.80%	N
Farmington River Reg.	\$2,909,838	113.3			\$12,094	107.89%	(\$57,581)
Freetown-Lakeville	\$16,788,080	106.7			\$9,503	84.77%	(\$29,573)
Frontier	\$8,134,474	129.5			\$13,218	117.91%	\$389,017
Gateway	\$13,375,038	117.4			\$10,442	93.15%	(\$162,733)
Gill-Montague	\$13,996,471	123.1			\$12,818	114.34%	(\$380,322)
Hampshire	\$8,170,116	119.9			\$9,983	89.05%	\$165,916
Hawlemont	\$1,336,040	120.4			\$12,181	108.66%	(\$8,855)
Lincoln-Sudbury	\$20,014,613	143.7			\$13,546	120.84%	N
Manchester Essex Reg.	\$14,629,521	136.5			\$12,436	110.94%	\$584,852
Martha's Vineyard	\$13,088,857	121.3			\$17,706	157.95%	N
Mohawk Trail			\$14,557,785	126.3	\$13,330	118.91%	\$93,508
Mount Greylock			\$7,522,197	120.1	\$14,202	126.69%	\$195,446
Narragansett	\$13,480,540	114.9			\$8,236	73.47%	\$153,206

Nauset	\$18,777,226	109.4			\$11,092	98.95%	N
Northboro-Southboro			\$12,527,124	134.6	\$11,484	102.44%	(\$25,880)
Old Rochester	\$12,571,225	130.8			\$11,837	105.59%	(\$20,600)
Pioneer Valley Reg.	\$11,155,211	136.6			\$11,593	103.42%	\$546,404
Quabog Reg.			\$11,700,107	105.0	\$8,735	77.92%	N
Ralph C. Mahar	\$9,953,151	143.9			\$12,444	111.01%	(\$437,269)
Silver Lake	\$16,984,007	122.5			\$11,359	101.33%	N
Southern Berkshire		120.9	\$10,804,533		\$12,354	110.21%	(\$306,166)
Southwick-Tolland	\$14,692,105	106.4			\$8,552	76.29%	\$236,855
Tantasqua	\$16,097,847	99.8			\$9,826	87.65%	\$456,750
Up-Island Reg.	\$7,338,327	182.6			\$18,462	164.69%	\$63,815

Appendix H – Small Districts Town LEA’s Financial Indicators

Town LEA	07 Actual Net School Spending	07 Actual Spending as % of Re	06 Actual Net School Spending	06 Actual Spending as % of Re	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost	FY 06 Per Pupil Cost as % of S	08 CHOICE Net Gain
Avon	\$6,548,953	113.4			\$10,328	92.13%	\$1,041,542
Ayer	\$11,757,007	114.7			\$10,151	90.55%	\$950,545
Boxborough	\$5,649,502	125.4			\$10,869	96.96%	(\$4,725)
Carver	\$19,255,291	122.8			\$9,919	88.48%	(\$3,641)
Cohasset	\$14,009,258	124.5			\$10,703	95.48%	N
Concord	\$25,925,589	149.5			\$14,411	128.55%	(\$2,900)
Douglas			\$11,213,175	106.3	\$7,732	68.97%	\$124,670
Easthampton	\$17,177,647	113.3			\$10,079	89.91%	(\$640,109)
Georgetow n	\$11,877,505	106.9			\$7,680	68.51%	(\$24,073)
Granby	\$8,430,587	104.3			\$8,744	78.00%	\$451,591
Greenfield	\$20,291,107	110.7			\$12,120	108.12%	(\$1,225,586)
Hadley	\$5,980,886	101.2			\$9,856	87.92%	(\$3,934)
Harvard	\$2,544,578	127.0			\$10,782	96.18%	\$415,727
Harw ich	\$11,048,961	130.6			\$11,428	101.94%	(\$400,635)
Hatfield	\$4,451,998	122.1			\$9,276	82.75%	(\$44,380)
Holbrook			\$11,617,612	141.4	\$9,478	84.55%	(\$35,630)
Hopedale	\$2,219,502	128.6			\$8,665	77.30%	\$301,868
Hull	\$15,832,166	120.5			\$12,484	111.36%	N
Lee	\$7,697,510	112.4			\$10,746	95.86%	\$206,145
Leicester	\$15,832,166	103.7			\$9,058	80.80%	\$67,086
Lenox	\$9,391,732	136.0			\$11,948	106.58%	\$557,015
Lincoln			\$9,207,610	149.1	\$15,651	139.62%	N
Littleton			\$14,818,360	123.9	\$10,445	93.18%	(\$62,471)
Lunenburg	\$14,561,883	113.8			\$9,106	81.23%	\$195,488
Maynard	\$2,822,480	125.8			\$11,496	102.55%	(\$22,323)
Millbury	\$17,865,709	116.1			\$9,830	87.69%	(\$93,310)
Millis	\$11,081,119	116.3			\$8,660	77.25%	(\$13,353)
Monson	\$12,000,128	100.4			\$8,454	75.41%	(\$101,817)
Nantuckett			\$21,169,215	163.6	\$18,564	165.60%	N
Norfolk	\$10,293,618	128.0			\$10,310	91.97%	(\$6,044)
North Adams	\$20,301,797	120.1			\$12,890	114.99%	(\$358,825)
North Brookfield	\$6,903,457	103.9			\$10,669	95.17%	(\$223,247)
Orange			\$6,527,555	108.5	\$10,175	90.77%	\$245,415
Palmer	\$18,093,939	110.9			\$10,026	89.44%	(\$129,796)
Petersham	\$1,122,797	126.5			\$9,105	81.22%	\$24,454
Plainville	\$7,219,240	119.5			\$9,132	81.46%	N
Provincetow n	\$4,648,334	209.4			\$22,663	202.17%	\$148,539
Rockport	\$11,208,764	128.6			\$11,019	98.30%	\$409,040
Sutton	\$13,215,634	108.1			\$8,708	77.68%	\$207,922
Ware	\$12,633,794	104.6			\$10,836	96.66%	(\$566,060)
Webster	\$17,138,731	104.3			\$10,543	94.05%	(\$166,163)
West Boylston	\$10,223,969	123.7			\$9,731	86.81%	\$452,657
West Bridgew ater	\$9,736,365	117.9			\$9,716	86.67%	\$838,152
Westport	\$14,842,112	101.5			\$9,187	81.95%	\$100,638
Williamstow n	\$4,627,754	117.7			\$11,398	101.68%	\$301,856
Winchenden	\$14,552,729	99.7			\$10,231	91.27%	(\$485,297)
Wrentham	\$9,263,836	108.5			\$8,796	78.47%	(\$9,618)